

GREEK MANUALS OF CHURCH DOCTRINE

1. Ἱερὰ Κατήχησις, ὑπὸ Δ. Ν. Βερναρδάκη.
Seventh Edition. Athens. 1889.
2. Ὁρθόδοξος Χριστιανικὴ Κατήχησις, ὑπὸ Ἰγνατίου
Μοσχάκη. Athens. 1890.
3. Χριστιανικὴ Κατήχησις, ὑπὸ Α. Διομήδους Κυριακοῦ.
Second and Enlarged Edition. Athens. 1896.
4. Ὁρθόδοξος Ἱερὰ Κατήχησις, ὑπὸ Νεκταρίου Κεφαλᾶ,
Μητροπολίτου Πενταπόλεως. Athens. 1899.

BY

THE REV. H. T. F. DUCKWORTH, M.A.

FORMERLY POSTMASTER OF MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD
REPRESENTATIVE IN CYPRUS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION

PUBLISHED FOR
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION

RIVINGTONS
34 KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN
LONDON

1901



P R E F A C E

SOME little time ago the Eastern Church Association published a short account of the Teaching of the Russian Church. Now, owing to the kindness of Mr. Duckworth, we are able to place at the disposal of our members a similar work on the Greek branch of the Eastern Church. This account has the advantage of being somewhat more authoritative, as Mr. Duckworth has an intimate personal knowledge of the inner workings of the Greek Church, and has put before us the current teaching in the Catechisms drawn up for present use.

The first point that we notice is the great pains which is taken that all members of the Orthodox Church may have an accurate knowledge of the teaching of the body to which they belong. It is clear that if the system which is described in these pages is carried out, the charge of ignorance which is commonly brought against the oriental churches cannot be for a moment sustained. The Greek layman must know a great deal more about his Church than the average English layman.

The second point is the generally speaking moderate tone which is exhibited. Although Mr. Duckworth very properly warns us against drawing incorrect conclusions, it is not quite without significance that the word for transubstantiation is never employed. Nor is the language used about other churches by any means narrow. With regard to this latter point it may be interesting to refer to the little tract on Anglican doctrine recently published by the Bishop of Salisbury, and translated into Greek by Mr. I. Gennadios for the sake of making known to the Greeks the teaching of the English Church. The tract in question has been widely circulated and well received. Amongst others the Archbishop of Syra says, that after studying it himself he has found no great differences between the opinions of members of the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches, while their faith is almost in entire harmony and accord with that of the latter. He notices, of course, certain differences in ritual order, which, however, he says, 'each prelate may regulate as he thinks fit in his own diocese.' He ends by expressing a hope that the tract may be the starting-point of a new movement towards union.


The Bishop of Salisbury adds, 'This acceptance of our position is all the more satisfactory, as

the tract in question does not disguise the points of difference on our side, though of course it treats those from whom we differ with proper consideration and respect.'

The main principle of the Eastern Church Association is that the more the two Churches get to know one another the better it will be for both. Each may learn from the other, and each may learn about the other. There are differences: there are differences which are not unimportant, differences which it will be difficult to surmount; but when once the two churches know one another, the differences will appear very slight compared with the points of agreement. It is to put shortly before members the teaching of the Greek Church that this book is published.

A. C. HEADLAM,

SECRETARY, EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

CONTENTS

PART I.

PAGE

Catechising and the importance attached to it by the Greek Church—Its Purpose and Method—The Teaching of the Greek Church with respect to Revelation, the Books of Holy Writ, and Ecclesiastical Tradition,	1
---	---

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

Particular Points of the Orthodox Religion—Free-will—Original Sin—Redemption—Faith and Works,	27
---	----

PART II. (*continued*).

CHAPTER II.

The Eucharist and Transubstantiation — Confession and Penance—Invocation of Saints—Icons and Relics—The Intermediate State,	47
---	----

APPENDIX.

The Orthodox Church and the Doctrine of Transubstantiation,	66
---	----

PART I

CATECHISING—IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO IT BY THE GREEK CHURCH—ITS PURPOSE AND METHOD—THE TEACHING OF THE GREEK CHURCH WITH RESPECT TO REVELATION, THE BOOKS OF HOLY WRIT, AND ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION.

GREEK MANUALS OF CHURCH DOCTRINE

I

IN every Greek public school, Religious Instruction (Ἱερά, Θρησκευτικά) is found as a proper part of the regular curriculum. Moreover, there are no Greek public schools, whether primary or secondary, where such instruction is 'undenominational.' It is always Orthodox. At the same time, it is not forced upon scholars who do not belong to the Orthodox Church, they being excused (if their parents so wish) from attendance during the hours devoted to catechetical or other instruction in the tenets of the Orthodox Church.

The importance attached to Catechetical Instruction in the Orthodox Faith, in Greece, may be gauged from the advertisements printed in the 'Χριστιανικὴ Κατήχησις' of M. Diomedes Kyriakos (2nd edition, Athens, 1896). The first is a note from the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Education. It runs as follows:—

To M. Anastasios Diomedes Kyriakos.

In pursuance of the Provisions of the Act (No. 2303) of July 12, 1895, regarding Text-books to be employed in

Secondary and State-assisted Normal Education, and of the Royal Mandate of October 10, 1895, also of the Report of the Special Committee of Judges appointed to examine Text-books intended for use in Greek Schools, we have the honour to inform you that we have accepted the recommendation of the said Committee, that your book, entitled *A Catechism*, which has been approved and selected in accordance with the provisions of the aforesaid Act, be put in use in Greek Schools, both State-assisted and private, for the term of five scholastic years, beginning with the scholastic year 1896-7.

D. G. PETRIDES, Minister of Ecclesiastical
Affairs and Public Education.

ATHENS, *April 29*, 1896.

ST. PARISIS.

The second, which is printed at the end of the 2nd edition, having been originally prefixed to the first, is a communication from the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece, as follows:—

*To M. Anastasios D. Kyriakos, Professor of Divinity
in the National University.*

The Synod returns you the manuscript copies of your *Christian Catechism* and *Christian Ethics* submitted to it for examination, and approves of the publication of these works.

ATHENS, *May 12*, 1876.

(Signatures.)

- + PROKOPIOS, Metropolitan of Athens, President of the Synod.
- + PARTHENIOS of Naxos.
- + MAKARIOS of Karystia.
- + ANTHIMOS of Naupaktia and Eurytania.

DAMASKENOS CHRISTOPOULOS ;

Archimandrite (Deputy-Clerk).

In writing this paper, I shall keep in view and refer to three other manuals of Church Doctrine, besides the 'Χριστιανική Κατήχησις' of M. Kyriakos. These

three are—(i) *Ἱερὰ Κατήχησις, ὑπὸ Δ. Ν. Βερναρδάκη*, (ii) *Ὁρθόδοξος Χριστιαν. Κατήχησις ὑπὸ Ἰγνατίου Μοσχάκη*, and (iii) *Ὁρθόδοξος Ἱερὰ Κατήχησις, ὑπὸ Νεκταρίου Κεφαλᾶ, Μητροπολίτου Πενταπόλεως*. The Catechism of M. Bernardakis (7th edition, Athens, 1889) was particularly selected, out of a number of religious text-books, for use in primary Greek schools by the Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople. This is the most elementary of the four Catechisms to which I shall refer. The Catechism of M. Moschakis is more advanced. It was published with the approval of the Holy Synod of Greece, and in 1888 was selected by the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs as the only Catechism to be used, for a period of four years, in the public schools of the kingdom. M. Kyriakos' book was originally compiled for use in girls' schools. It is a larger work than that of M. Moschakis, as it deals with some points in greater detail. We have already noticed its authorisation for general use in Greek public schools. The Catechism of the Metropolitan of Pentapolis, who is Principal of the Rhizareion (a theological seminary founded in 1843) at Athens, is intended for the use of those who have entered upon a regular course of theological study. It was published last year, with the approval of the Holy Synod. Its employment, therefore, in any orthodox seminary would be lawful and right, but it is not intended for general use in schools, and therefore the Ministry of Education was not asked to authorise it for that purpose. A series of notes is appended, illustrating and expanding various points of the doctrine set forth

in the text. Catechetical Instruction holds the first place in the list of subjects which make up the Divinity Course of the Rhizareion, and the duty of imparting this instruction is, by the statutes of the seminary as revised and amended in 1897, incumbent, *ex officio*, upon the Principal.

The simplest definition of catechism given in the name of the Greek Church is naturally to be sought and found in the elementary manual of M. Bernardakis. It is 'the lesson in which we learn what are our duties towards God.'¹ In the manuals of MM. Moschakis and Kyriakos, it is defined as 'summary instruction concerning the Christian religion.'² In the Catechism of Bishop Nektarios it is more particularly defined as 'the teaching of the Church of Christ, by means of which the catechumen, and the Christian child who has not yet been a catechumen,³ are fully instructed in the dogmatic and moral truths of Christianity.'

Treating of the necessity for catechising, Bishop Nektarios points out that, in obedience to our Lord's final injunction to His Apostles, and in accordance with the Apostles' example and practice, the Church has always made it her rule to catechise first and baptize afterwards.⁴ Infants are catechised in the

¹ Κατήχησις λέγεται τὸ μάθημα, τὸ ὅποιον μᾶς διδάσκει ποῖα εἶναι τὰ χρέη μας πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.

² ἡ συνοπτικὴ διδασκαλία περὶ τῆς χριστιανικῆς θρησκείας.—Mosch. § 1; Kyr. § 1.

³ ὁ κατηχούμενος καὶ ὁ μὴ κατηχηθεὶς παῖς χριστιανός. The Bishop is careful to point out that a Catechism is 'an instruction to be learned of every person.'

⁴ Nektarios, 'Κατήχησις.' Intr., ch. iii. § 3: 'περὶ τῆς ἀναγκαϊότητος τῆς Κατηχήσεως.'

persons of their god-parents.'¹ The earliest bishops succeeded the Apostles in their catechetical function, but as time went on, not only bishops, but presbyters, deacons, and even readers—Bishop Nektarios instances Optatus in Carthage and Origen in Alexandria—became eligible as catechists. The catechumens usually received their instruction in church, but in Alexandria, Jerusalem, and in the larger cities generally, special rooms or buildings were provided for them.²

The aim and purpose of catechetical teaching is to impart knowledge of the things a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health, and to stablish him in that faith and knowledge. His confession of faith must spring from sound knowledge and hearty conviction, so that he may not only know what he believes, but why he does and ought to believe it, and give an account of the faith that is in him.³ Faith resting upon Christ is required, for this faith is

¹ See Euchologion, pp. 134, 135 (Venice, 1891). The Ἀνάδοχος, or godfather, 'taught by the priest,' makes formal renunciation of Satan and all his works, and profession of allegiance to Christ, and recites the Nicene Creed. The questions, Ἀποτάσσει τῷ Σατανᾷ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ; Ἀπετάξω τῷ Σατανᾷ; Συντάσσει τῷ Χριστῷ; Συνετάξω τῷ Χριστῷ; Καὶ πιστεύεις αὐτῷ; are each put and answered *thrice*, and the Nicene Creed is likewise recited *thrice*. This certainly is *κατήχησις*.

² Nektarios, Intr., ch. iii. § 3, pp. 17, 18. The Bishop of Pentapolis has some good notes in his Appendix upon the subject of catechising in the early ages of the Church.

³ Nektarios, p. 18: 'διὰ τῆς κατηχήσεως ὁ Χριστιανὸς διδάσκεται νὰ πιστεύῃ ἐν ἐπιγνώσει καὶ ἐν πληροφορίᾳ τῆς καρδίας, νὰ διατελῇ ἕτοιμος εἰς ἀπολογίαν πρὸς πάντα ζητοῦντα λόγον τῆς πίστεώς του κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Πέτρου . . . (Α'. Πέτρ. γ'. 15. πρβλ. Τίτ. β'. 8.), καὶ νὰ διακρίνῃ τὴν ἀληθὴ καὶ θεῖαν αὐτοῦ πίστιν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θρησκευτικῶν πλασμάτων.' See also Kyriakos, § 47, p. 94.

‘the only defence whereby a man is justified, the only door leading into life eternal.’ And this justifying faith is ‘the common work’ of Divine grace and the human will co-operating.¹ Of this faith, also, works are the necessary expression, for without them it is dead.²

In one of the notes appended to his Catechism,³ Bishop Nektarios cites a passage from the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 5), which contains a description of the manner and order in which the catechetical lessons were delivered. ‘He that is to be taught in the law of godliness’ (so runs the passage referred to), ‘let him, before his baptism, be instructed in the knowledge of the Unbegotten, let him thoroughly learn the knowledge of the Only-begotten Son, and be brought unto sure and certain belief as concerning the Holy Ghost. Let him learn the sundry and manifold acts of creation, in their order, the successive manifestations of Divine Providence, the divers ordinances of the law. Let him be taught why the universe was created, and that therefore a man’s city is the universe. Let him be fully taught in the knowledge of his own nature, its laws, its capabilities, its tendencies. Let him learn also, how God punished the wicked with flood or fire, and glorified His saints, in every generation. Also, let him be taught in all that pertains to the Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection from the dead, and Ascension of

¹ Nektarios, p. 19.

² Bernardakis, p. 28; Moschakis, p. 23: ‘ὅταν πιστεύωμεν ἀπλῶς εἰς αὐτὸν χωρὶς νὰ πράττωμεν τὰς ἐντολὰς του, ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν εἶναι νεκρά’ (Ἰακ. β’. 20). Nektarios *l.c.*

³ Note I, p. 228.

our Lord. Let him learn what renunciation of the devil is, and allegiance to Christ.’¹

The course of instruction, then, exhibited in the above-quoted passage, fell into three parts—(1) A summary of Old and New Testament History; (2) Christian Dogma; (3) Christian Ethics—unless we prefer to recognise a division into two parts, viz.—(1) Sacred History; (2) Christian Philosophy.

The modern Catechisms under review deal with the same subjects as those which were included in the regular course of Christian instruction in ancient times, as represented in the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

The proper bases of catechetical teaching, as delivered in the Greek Church generally, are the Nicene Creed—which, for all Orthodox Christians, is *the* Creed—and the Decalogue. Catechising, then, is the interpretation and explanation of the Creed and the Decalogue, developing the truths of the Christian religion implicit in these summaries, by the aid of (1) the text of Holy Scripture: (2) ancient tradition, *i.e.* the unanimous teaching of the Ancient Fathers; and (3) right reasoning. The Creed is the summary statement of the ‘credenda’ or theoretical truths of the Christian religion, whilst the Decalogue is the summary of the ‘agenda’ or practical truths. The former contains the articles of Christian belief, the latter those of Christian morals.²

¹ Nektarios, p. 229.

² Τὸ σύμβολον τῆς πίστεως καὶ τὸν δεκάλογον τοῦτον ἐξηγεῖ ἡ Κατήχησις, καὶ οὕτω ἐκθέτει τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς χριστιανικῆς θρησκείας, ἀναπτύσσουσα τὰς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας Γραφῆς, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας παραδόσεως δηλ. τῆς ὁμοφώνου διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀρχαίων πατέρων, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου.—Kyriakos, § 8, pp. 23, 24. Cf. Bernardakis, p. 21.

In the exposition of Christian morals, the Decalogue is interpreted according to Christ's summary thereof in the first and second 'great Commandments of the Law,' and His teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. The Nine Beatitudes are a summary of the teaching of Christ, the first principles of the Evangelical Law (as distinguished from the Mosaic), from which the exposition of that Law must begin. The Sermon on the Mount crowns and completes the moral teaching of the Old Testament, whilst it is the base and foundation of that of the New.¹ Accordingly, the Nine Beatitudes are appointed for rehearsal by the catechumen in the Catechisms of Bishop Nektarios and M. Bernardakis.²

Besides the Beatitudes, there is another passage from the New Testament which occupies an important place in Greek catechetical teaching, *i.e.* the Lord's Prayer. In the Catechism of M. Bernardakis the Lord's Prayer is introduced in the third, or ethical, part of the work, as the best expression of those sentiments of love and fear towards God, the cultivation of which is implicitly required of us in the First Commandment.³ Bishop Nektarios also brings in the Lord's Prayer and the exposition thereof, petition by petition, in the ethical part of his Catechism. Prayer is the expression of that hope and trust in God which is commanded us in the Sermon on the Mount, and the Lord's Prayer is the model

¹ Nektarios, pp. 107, 108; Bernardakis, pp. 42, 43. Cf. Kyriakos, pp. 112, 113.

² Nektarios, p. 109; Bernardakis, p. 43.

³ Bernardakis, pp. 30-32.

of all prayer.¹ On the other hand, MM. Kyriakos and Moschakis treat of the Lord's Prayer in connection with the Creed, *i.e.* in the dogmatic portion of their Catechisms. The function of the Church is to pursue the sanctification of men, and the means whereby this is attained are—(1) Teaching; (2) Prayer; and (3) Sacraments. The Lord's Prayer and the exposition of it come in when the second of these means is dealt with.²

The order in which the various points of doctrine are successively dealt with in Greek Catechisms is exhibited in the following table. The Catechism of M. Bernardakis is taken first, as being the simplest, and that of Bishop Nektarios last, as the most advanced:—

¹ Nektarios, pp. 120, 121. Exposition of the Lord's Prayer, pp. 122-126.

² Kyriakos, §§ 42, 44, 45 (pp. 85-86, 87-92); Moschakis, §§ 31, 33, 36 (pp. 26, 27, 29).

1. BERNARDAKIS.

Προεισαγωγή.

Containing the questions:—What is Catechism?—What are our duties towards God, who has revealed them, and how ought we to fulfil them?—What is Holy Writ?—Where do we find summaries of our duty towards God?

Μέρος Α'.
Δογματικόν,
ἡ περὶ πίστεως.

Rehearsal and exposition of the Nicene Creed.

Μέρος Β'.
Ἱεροτελεστικόν,
ἡ περὶ Μυστηρίων.

Doctrine of the Seven Sacraments, their respective purposes, and the form and manner of their administration.

Μέρος Γ'.
Ἠθικόν, ἡ περὶ Θείου
Νόμου.

Rehearsal and Exposition of the Decalogue and the Nine Beatitudes.

2. MOSCHAKIS.

Εἰσαγωγή.

What is Catechism?—What is Religion?—What is Revelation, and where is it contained?—Division of Catechism—Rehearsal of the Nicene Creed.

Μέρος Α'.
Δογματικόν.

Exposition of the Creed:—

I. *Of God.*—His existence and attributes—The Trinity—Creation of the world and of man—Fall of man—Sin and its effects.

II. *Of Jesus Christ.*—The Incarnation—Christ's Redemptive Work.

III. *Of the Holy Ghost.*—Regeneration and Sanctification.

IV. *Of the Church.*—Its function—Preaching, Prayer, and Sacraments—The Seven Sacraments.

V. *Of the future Life.*

Μέρος Β'. Ἠθικόν.

Rehearsal of the Decalogue, and exposition thereof.

3. KYRIAKOS.

Εἰσαγωγή.

What is Catechism?—What is Religion?—What is Revelation?—What is Holy Writ?—Where do we find Christian Doctrine summarised?—Rehearsal of Creed and Decalogue.

Μέρος Α'. Χριστιανικά Δόγματα.

Exposition of the Creed divided into the following chapters:—

I. *Of God.*—His existence and attributes—The Trinity—The creation of the world and of man—Providence—Fall of Man—Sin, its nature and consequences.

II. *Of Jesus Christ and His Redemptive Work.*—The Incarnation—The teaching, the life, and the death of Jesus Christ—Their power and worth.

III. *Of the Holy Ghost and Regeneration.*

IV. *Of the Church and its history.*

V. *The Means of Salvation, i.e. preaching, prayer, and sacraments*—Doctrine of the Seven Sacraments.

VI. *Of the life to come.*

Μέρος Β'. Χριστιανική Ἠθική.

Exposition of the Decalogue.

4. NEKTARIOS.

* Προεισαγωγή.—Περὶ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς ἀναπτύξεως τῆς διδασκαλίας τῆς Κατήχησεως. For imparting the truths of Holy Writ and Sacred Tradition Catechism is divided into three parts—(1) Dogmatic; (2) Ethical; (3) Ritual and Ceremonial.

Εἰσαγωγή.—Containing three chapters—(i) Of Catechism, what it is, and its sources; (ii) Of Holy Writ; (iii) Of the Church—its purpose and function, its history, of the necessity of Catechism, of grace and free-will.

Μέρος Πρώτον.—Ἀνάπτυξις τῶν Δογματικῶν Ἀρχῶν τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ.

(The statement and exposition of the Creed come at the end of this part, but the order in which the subjects are treated is almost exactly the same as in Kyriakos, though at much greater length. In connection with the creation of man, the nature of the soul, death, and the intermediate state are dealt with. The dogma of the Trinity is also reserved for the conclusion of this part.)

Μέρος Δεύτερον.—Ἠθικά.

The Decalogue—The Sermon on the Mount—The religious and moral virtues and their opposite vices—Moral good and evil.

Μέρος Τρίτον.—Τελετουργικόν.

Of Sacred Tradition—Of worship—The Seven Sacraments—Of the Councils of the Church.

The matter which Bishop Nektarios and M. Bernardakis reserve for a separate part or section is dealt with by MM. Moschakis and Kyriakos under the article of the Church (Moschakis, *Μέρος Α'.* § iv.; Kyriakos, *Μέρος Α'. κεφ. ε'.* §§ 46-53). Bishop Nektarios takes the first part of his Catechism as exhibiting the dogmatic truths of Holy Writ, the second as setting forth the moral truths drawn from the same source, whilst in the third are expounded the 'truths and mysteries, which the Church has received through sacred tradition, and preserves as Apostolic institutions and Divine ordinances.'¹

Let us now see what manner of teaching, with regard to Revelation and Holy Writ, is imparted to the children of the Orthodox Greek Church.

In religion, man enters into communion and relation with GOD,² this relation implying, on the part of man, faith and fear, love and hope in GOD and towards GOD, so that 'religion' (*θρησκεία*) means the same as 'piety' (*εὐσέβεια*). It is naturally implanted in human nature, as is proved by its existence, in some form or other, in every tribe and race of mankind, in every degree of civilisation. It is more than knowledge, for true religion is rooted in the heart, and manifests itself in good works.³

Revelation is of two kinds—(1) Revelation general: (2) Revelation proper or historical. The first kind, again, is given in two ways—outwardly and inwardly.

¹ Nektarios, *Προεισαγωγή*.

² Kyriakos, § 2: *Θρησκεία είναι ἡ κοινωνία καὶ σχέσις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.*

³ Moschakis, § 2; Kyriakos, § 2.

GOD reveals Himself through Nature or the Universe (Ps. xix. 1; Rom. i. 20). This is the external way of His general self-revelation. Also, GOD reveals Himself inwardly, through the voice of Conscience, which praises us when we do right and reproves us when we do wrong. In conscience man bears the idea of GOD implanted. Through the beauty and order of the world without, testifying to GOD as the Creator, and the voice of Conscience within, testifying to Him as the Judge, of all, the Almighty has revealed Himself at all times and in all places. But He has also vouchsafed His proper revelation of Himself, conveyed to men through Moses and the other prophets of Israel, and above all by His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.¹

Of this, the proper, especial, or historical revelation made by GOD of Himself and His holy will, we have the records in certain books which are collectively denoted by the name 'Holy Scripture.' Since everything great and Divine comes from above, 'from the Father of lights,' we believe that the authors of these sacred books wrote under the guidance of the Holy Ghost—they were 'inspired' or 'illuminated' by GOD (2 Peter i. 21).²

'The books of Holy Scripture are divided into the books of the Old, and the books of the New, Covenant. Religion is generally spoken of in Holy Scripture as a Covenant, being regarded as a sort of treaty and agreement between GOD and man, wherein GOD promises protection and help to those who keep His commandments, whilst man is bound to the observance of these

¹ Moschakis, § 3; Kyriakos, § 4.

² Moschakis, § 4; Kyriakos, § 5.

commandments (Exodus xxiv. 7). For this reason the books of the Mosaic or ancient religion were called the books of the Old Covenant, whilst those of Christianity, the new religion, were called the books of the New Covenant. The former contain the teaching of Moses and the Prophets, and the general history of the Mosaic religion, and were composed by the Prophets. The latter contain the teaching of Jesus Christ and the Apostles, and the earliest history of the Christian religion. They were written by the Apostles. The writers of the Old Covenant wrote in the Hebrew language, but their books were translated into Greek by the Seventy (B.C. 290). They have also been translated into other languages, ancient and modern. The writers of the New Covenant wrote in Greek, because at the time when Christianity first appeared, Greek was the common language of the greater part of the then known world, being in use in Palestine as well as elsewhere. This general and widespread use of the Greek language dated from the time of Alexander the Great. The value of Holy Scripture is exceedingly great, for no other book contains truer ideas of God and of morality (*ἠθικὴ*), or more excellent examples of piety and virtue. Holy Scripture is the first and greatest of religious classics.’¹

¹ From Kyriakos, § 5, p. 16. In the Appendix to his Catechism, Note 1, Bishop Nektarios says: ‘*Διὰ τῆς λέξεως ταύτης (sc. τῆς διαθήκης) οἱ Ἑβδομήκοντα μεταφράζουσι τὴν Ἑβραϊκὴν λέξιν περὶθ, Berith, ἥτις ἔχει ὅτε μὲν τὴν σημασίαν τῆς διαθήκης, ὅτε δὲ τὴν σημασίαν τῆς συνθήκης, ὅθεν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἑλληνικῷ κειμένῳ τῆς Π. Δ. ὁ ὅρος Διαθήκη, δι’ οὗ μεταφέρεται ὁ Ἑβραϊκὸς ὅρος περὶθ Berith ἔχει καὶ τὴν σημασίαν τῆς συνθήκης.*’ In a footnote to chap. i. of the *Εἰσαγωγή (περὶ ἱερᾶς Κατηχήσεως)* he gives the general religious significance of *διαθήκη* as ‘*τὴν ἑκφρασιν τῆς θείας βουλῆς καὶ διαβεβαίωσιν τῆς πληρώσεως τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν· τῶν δοθεισῶν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ*

The books contained in the Old Testament are arranged by M. Kyriakos in three divisions—the historical, the didactic, and the prophetic. The *historical* division contains Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kings, Paralipomena (Chronicles), carrying down the sacred history from the Creation to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, the record being continued in the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Maccabees. The *didactic* division contains Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, Tobit, and Judith. Finally, the *prophetic* books are the Four Major and Twelve Minor Prophets.¹

It will be seen that certain books are included in this canon of the Old Testament which are excluded from the canon recognised and accepted by the English Church. In a note at the end of the section in which this list and arrangement of the Old Testament scriptures appears, M. Kyriakos observes that the Jews of Alexandria accepted, whilst those of Palestine rejected, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees, and that the opinions and views of the Jews of Palestine have been adopted by the

ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.' On p. 11 the catechumen is taught that the names 'Old' and 'New Testament' are given to the sacred books because they contain the covenants (διαθήκαι) which God has made with mankind, these covenants being (1) *the Covenant made in Eden* (Gen. ii. 16, 17; Sirach, xvii. 11, 12); (2) *the Covenant made with Abraham* (Gen. xv. and xvii.); (3) *the Covenant of Sinai* (Ex. xxxiv. 27, xix. 5, 6, xxxiii. 22); (4) *the New Covenant of which Christ was the Mediator* (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24, xvi. 16; Luke xxii. 20; Heb. viii. 6, 7).

¹ Kyriakos, § 6.

Protestants, whereas the Orthodox and Catholics alike receive and venerate these books, 'and rightly so, for they are pervaded by the same spirit of purest piety, which is dominant in the rest of the Old Testament.'¹

The subject of the Canon of the Old Testament is naturally dealt with more at length and with more precision in Bishop Nektarios' Catechism, from which we transcribe the following questions and answers²:—

Q. How many books are there in the Old Testament?

A. The books of the Old Testament are twenty-two in number.

Q. What are they called?

A. Canonical, as composing the canon of Ezra.

Q. Are there any others, besides these canonical books?

A. Yes. These others are called deutero-canonical by the Catholics, and apocryphal by the Protestants. The Fathers of the Church call them *ἀναγινωσκόμενα*.

Q. What are the canonical books of the Old Testament?

A. The following are the canonical books—(1) Genesis, (2) Exodus, (3) Leviticus, (4) Numbers, and (5) Deuteronomy. These five constitute the Pentateuch. (6) The book of Jesus the son of Navé, (7) Judges, with an appendix called 'Ruth,' (8) the First and the Second Book of Kings, (9) the Third and the Fourth Book of Kings, (10) the Books of the Paralipomena, (11) Esdras or the Priest, and the First and the Second Discourse of Neēmias, (12) Esther, (13) Job, (14) the Psalter of David, (15) the Proverbs of Solomon, (16) Ecclesiastes, (17) the Song of Songs, (18) Esaias, (19) Jeremias and the Lamentations of Jeremias, (20) Ezekiel, (21) Daniel, and (22) the

¹ Kyriakos, note on § 6, pp. 18, 19. The English Church certainly recognises the value of the two deutero-canonical Books of Wisdom.

² Nektarios, pp. 4, 5.

Dodecapropheton, or the books of the twelve prophets commonly called minor.’

This canon, Bishop Nektarios observes, follows the version of the Seventy as exhibited in an ancient Alexandrine codex, the text of which was published at Athens in 1850. The Bishop also notices that the First and Second Books of Kings are the First and Second of Samuel in the Hebrew texts, whilst the Third and Fourth of Kings and the First and Second of Paralipomena appear there as the First and Second of Kings and the First and Second of Chronicles.¹

Bishop Nektarios continues as follows:—

‘Q. What are the deuterocanonical Books, or ἀναγινωσκόμενα?

A. They are the following:—(1) The Book of Tobit, (2) Judith, (3) the Priest, (4) the First, Second, and Third Books of the Maccabees, and the following additamenta, (5) Baruch, (6) the Letter of Jeremias, (7) the Wisdom of Solomon, (8) the Wisdom of Sirach.’²

In his Appendix (note 2) the Bishop points out that the Orthodox Christian Canon includes the books of the Hebrew Canon (which is followed in the English version. Cf. Article VI.) and the following books besides:—(1) the First Book of Esdras, (2) Tobit, (3) Judith, (4) the Wisdom of Solomon, (5) the Wisdom of Sirach, (6) the three Books of the Maccabees (relating the national struggle against the Seleucidae and the sufferings of the Jews in Egypt under Ptolemy

¹ Nektarios, notes on p. 5. He does not say whether the Alexandrine codex is the famous one presented by Cyril Lucar to King Charles I.

² Nektarios, p. 6.

Philopator), and (7) certain additions and appendices—additional chapters to the text of *Esther*, additions or appendices to *Jeremiah* in the Letter of Jeremiah and the Book of Baruch, and appendices to *Daniel* in the Book of Susanna, the Prayer of Azarias, the Song of the Three Holy Children, and the story of Bel and the Dragon.

Bishop Nektarios maintains the division of the Old Testament Scriptures into historical, didactic, and prophetical books.¹ But he reckons Judith and Tobit as historical, whilst, as we have seen, M. Kyriakos places them in the didactic class. The ‘two books of Esdras,’ according to him, are of late composition, the first dating from the second century B.C., the second from the time of Alexander the Great, to which epoch the history of Nehemiah is also assigned.² He considers the Book of Job to have been composed in the time of Solomon.³

M. Kyriakos divides the books of the New Testament into—(1) *Historical*, viz., the four Gospels and the Acts: (2) *Didactic*, viz., the Pauline and ‘Catholic’ Epistles: and (3) *Prophetical*, the Apocalypse. He reckons the Epistle to the Hebrews as an Epistle of S. Paul. The title of ‘Catholic’ is thus explained—ἐπειδὴ αἱ πλεῖσται αὐτῶν δὲν ἀποτείνονται πρὸς ὀρισμένην ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς καθ’ ὅλον τὸν κόσμον διεσπαρμένους χριστιανούς. M. Kyriakos teaches the catechumens that

¹ Nektarios, pp. 6, 7, 185-191.

² *Ibid.* p. 186.

³ *Ibid.* p. 187. In his appended note (pp. 184-192) on the Canon of the Old Testament, the Bishop gives various details regarding the date or authorship or both of the several books, and the lives of the prophets.

‘Matthew and John were disciples of the Lord, Mark a disciple of Peter, and Luke a disciple of Peter and Paul.’ He also sets before them an outline of the chronology of S. Paul’s Epistles as follows:—

Thessalonians I. and II.,	} Before A.D. 59.
Romans, Galatians,	
Corinthians I. and II.,	
Colossians, Ephesians,	} Time of imprisonment in Caesarea and Rome, A.D. 59-63.
Philippians, Philemon,	
Timothy I. and II., Titus,	} After release from imprisonment in Rome and a little before the Apostle’s death, A.D. 64-66. ¹
Hebrews,	

In the text of his Catechism,² Bishop Nektarios reckons fourteen Epistles of S. Paul—Hebrews being counted in as of S. Paul’s composition, but in his note on the Canon of the New Testament he observes that ‘*περὶ τοῦ συγγραφέως οὐδεμία ὑπῆρχε συμφωνία μεταξὺ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων πατέρων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.*’ He quotes, on the one hand, Origen’s view that the Epistle was the work of some one who had redacted notes of the Apostle’s teaching, and, on the other, the reception of the Epistle as Pauline in authorship as well as doctrine by Basil the Great, the two Gregories, Chrysostom, and other Fathers, and by the Council of Laodicea in the 60th Canon. From the language and manner of composition generally, and the evidence of ch. ii. 3, Bishop Nektarios is led to the conclusion shared by most com-

¹ Kyriakos, §.7.

² Nektarios, p. 7.

mentators that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by some follower of S. Paul, whom he identifies as Apollos. With regard to the *date*, he concludes, from xiii. 7, that it was written after the death of the ‘pillars’ of the Church in Jerusalem, and (presumably from x. 11, xiii. 10, 11) before the destruction of the temple, *i.e.* not long before A.D. 70, and with regard to the place from which it was sent, that it was Corinth, or Ephesus, or some place between Rome and Jerusalem.¹

It is on the authority of tradition that the Scriptures are (in the first instance, at least) received as inspired, and this authority, in the Greek Church, is recognised as valid for the decision of other questions besides that of the Canon of Holy Writ. The Orthodox expounder of the Creed and the Decalogue must be guided, not by the text of the sacred books exclusively, but also by tradition and sound reasoning.² By tradition is meant ‘the unanimous teaching of the Ancient Fathers.’³ It is a source of Christian truth of equal value with the written word.⁴ Scripture itself testifies to the existence and authority of tradition.⁵ The Protestants err in rejecting tradition and recognising Scripture only as the true source of Christian doctrine, as though the faith of the Church became corrupted immediately after the last of the Apostles had passed away, for it is

¹ Nektarios, pp. 192, 193, 204, 205.

² Catechetical instruction unfolds the truths of the Christian religion—1. ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας Γραφῆς. 2. ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας παραδόσεως, 3. ἐκ τοῦ ὁρθοῦ λόγου—Kyriakos, § 8, *ad fin.*

³ Kyriakos, *l.c.*

⁴ Nektarios, pp. 11, 12, and 166.

⁵ Nektarios, *l.c.*, quoting 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2; 2 Thess. ii. 15; 1 Cor. xi. 2, 23, xv. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 20. In a note on p. 12 (where he calls tradition the ἄγραφον τεύχος of the Gospel) he cites 2 John 12.

quite improbable that the disciples and immediate successors of the Apostles, and the early Fathers of the Church whose day was so near to the Apostolic age, should have misinterpreted or perverted the Christian religion.¹ In so far as they reject the authority of ecclesiastical tradition, Protestants are heretics,² for

¹ Kyriakos, note on § 8, p. 24.

² The Church of England figures in Bishop Nektarios' catalogue of latter-day heresies, p. 15. This catalogue is headed by the Western, i.e. Roman, Church. The following extracts from pp. 14, 15 (in the text of the Catechism) and p. 226 (in the Appendix on modern heresies) may be found interesting:—

Pp. 14, 15. Q. Which are the most important churches now existing which have departed from the Orthodox spirit of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church?

A. First, the Western Church, which has introduced innovations upon many points, especially the dogma of the Procession of the Holy Ghost.

Secondly, the Church of the Protestants, which arose in the sixteenth century after Christ, having separated itself from the Western Church. It is divided into—

1. The *Lutherans*—so called from Martin Luther (1483-1546), a monk of Eisleben in Prussia. The Lutherans are also called Evangelicals (Εὐαγγελισταί).
2. The *Calvinists*, who derive their name from John Calvin of Noyon (Νοβιονῶ) in France (1509-1561) and are also called Reformers (ἀναμορφῶται). Both these (communions) receive Holy Scripture as the only source of Christianity, and reject the sacred Apostolic tradition. Lutheranism has spread over the northern parts of Germany and the Scandinavian kingdoms. Calvinism has made its way into certain regions of France, the Low Countries, and Scotland. In Scotland it was so far modified as to constitute a separate Church, viz., the Scottish or Presbyterian, also called Puritan
3. The Anglicans or Episcopalians (Ἐπισκοπιανοί). These are Protestants of the English Church who have entirely rejected Ecclesiastical tradition, though they have retained the ministry (Ἱερωσύνη) with its three orders (βαθμοί) and the hierarchy of the Church, and, in part, the ancient order of the administration of the Divine Eucharist.

P. 226. Bishop Nektarios adduces the Quakers and Puritans as

the Church has borne from the first a commission to teach, a commission received from Heaven, not of men.¹ This sacred tradition, the 'unwritten volume of the Divine Law,' is preserved whole and undefiled in the Orthodox Eastern Church, and in that Church alone. 'The True, the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, which is signified in the Creed, is our Orthodox Eastern Church, for whilst the Western and Protestant Churches have in many points perverted Christian doctrine, our Church has preserved it pure and un-

instances of heretics who have revived ancient errors, condemned many ages back by the Church Catholic. With regard to the 'Quakers or Shakers' (Οἱ Κονάκεροι ἤτοι τρέμοντες) he points out that they speak of themselves as the Society of Friends, and that the name 'Quaker' was bestowed upon them in mockery. 'The founder of this sect (αἵρεσις),' he says, 'was a fanatic English bootmaker named George Fox ("Ἀγγλος τις σανδαλοποιὸς ἐνθουσιαστῆς Γεώργιος Φῶξ), who died in 1691. The Quakers have undergone many persecutions, but for all that have maintained themselves to the present day, in England and elsewhere, especially in America. In most respects they are as Protestants in general, but differ in their peculiar tenet (δόγμα) of Divine Illumination. According to this, every Quaker is inwardly enlightened by God, concerning every truth of religion, and the inspired teaching which proceeds from this illumination is the first and principal source of their form of Christianity, Scripture being a secondary help. They have, therefore, no ministers (ιερεῖς)—not even in name—but each one, upon receiving inspiration, preaches in the church, whatever that may be which he has been inspired to pronounce, and howsoever he may have been inspired to pronounce it. In practical life, however, the Quakers are as a rule most moral and virtuous.' Of the Puritans, Nektarios says that they suffered much persecution, and have experienced many changes, in Scotland and England, more especially in England, so that the names 'Scottish,' 'Puritan' (Καθαρισταί), and 'Presbyterian' must not be regarded as exactly interchangeable, but as denoting sects more or less removed from the original Calvinism, or (as far as regards England) from the dominating Episcopal or Anglican 'High Church.' In opposition to this (the Episcopal) Church, the Presbyterians, and their like are called Nonconformists (μὴ συμμορφούμενοι) or Dissenters (διαφωνοῦντες).

¹ Nektarios, p. 11.

stained, as the Apostles delivered it.'¹ 'The Eastern Orthodox Church alone is the true Church of Christ. It is called Orthodox, because it holds the right persuasion (*δοξάζει ὀρθά*), that is to say, it maintains and teaches the correct principles of the Christian Faith, as it received them from Christ and the Apostles, and as they have been interpreted and expounded by the Seven Oecumenical Councils.' There are heresies abroad at this day, even as there were of old time, and the first of these present-day heresies is that of the 'Latins, Westerns, or Papists, who have separated from the true Church of Christ, and are subject to the Pope of Rome.' Besides the Latins, there are the Protestant heretics, 'who have separated from the Pope and no longer obey him. They are again divided into Lutherans, Calvinists, and other heresies without number (*ἀναρίθμητοι αἵρέσεις*).'² The Roman Church fell through turning aside into innovation after innovation,³ and its corruption provoked the Protestant insurrection. But the Protestants, in acknowledging the written Word alone as the source and measure of Christian truth, assailed not only the innovations, corruptions, and abuses of the Roman Church, but the true traditions also, preserved from the beginning in the Eastern Church.⁴

¹ Moschakis, § 30.

² Bernardakis, p. 19.

³ Kyriakos, § 41, p. 84. M. Kyriakos classifies the Roman errors of innovation as affecting—(1) Doctrine—the Filioque; (2) Church Government—Papal Supremacy; (3) Worship and practice—Aspersion (*ῥάντισμα*) in Baptism, Communion of the Laity in one kind only, Pardons, Doctrine of Purgatory, the *Inquisition*.

⁴ Kyriakos, § 41, p. 85.

In the Appendix to his Catechism,¹ Bishop Nektarios cites a number of texts from the Patrology in support of the Orthodox view respecting ecclesiastical tradition. We have already noticed his references to Scripture for testimonies to tradition.² To these references we may point out that he adds another in the appended note which deals specially with Ἱερὰ παράδοσις—this being John xxi. 25, ‘Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφηται καθ’ ἓν, οὐδὲ αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία.’ The catena of authorities from the Patrology cited by the Bishop contains the following names—Epistola ad Diognetum, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Rufinus, Innocent I., Isidore of Pelusium, Socrates, the Quinisext Council, John of Damascus, the Second Nicene Council.³ Besides these, Dionysius the Areopagite and the so-called Ignatian Epistle to Heron are brought forward in evidence.⁴ In the course of the note containing these citations, Bishop Nektarios expressly points out that it is tradition which guarantees Scripture (as he shows by

¹ Note 21, pp. 254-258.

² Catechism, p. 166. *Vide sup.* p. 21, n. 5.

³ The Bishop does not indicate in every case the book, chapter, page, etc. This is a defect which we may hope to see made good in a subsequent edition of his Catechism.

⁴ Bishop Nektarios unfortunately quotes the Pseudo-Ignatius as though he were the true Ἰγνάτιος ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος. However, Pseudo-Ignatius may be taken as a true witness for the fourth century, if not for the sub-apostolic age. His language is somewhat vehement: ‘πᾶς ὁ λέγων παρὰ τὰ διατεταγμένα, κἂν ἀξιόπιστος ᾖ, κἂν νηστεύῃ, κἂν σημεία ποιῇ, καὶ προφητεύῃ, λίκος φανέσθω ἐν προβάτου δορᾷ προβάτων βορὰν κατεργαζόμενος.’

reference to Origen ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25, Rufinus, and Innocent I., who testify to the traditional basis of the Canon), and, to a very great extent, the rites and ceremonies of worship. The reference to John of Damascus is made for the purpose of exemplifying the bearing of tradition on ceremonies and forms. The Damascene divine, after quoting several texts from the Old and New Testament as the *rationale* of the custom of facing eastwards in worshipping, concludes, ‘Ἀγράφος δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ παράδοσις αὕτη τῶν ἀποστόλων. Πολλὰ γὰρ ἀγράφως ἡμῖν παρέδωκαν.’¹

¹ The passage (not indicated by the Bishop) is *De Fide Orthodoxa*, iv. xii. In support of this traditional custom, though not as the source of it, John of Damascus refers to Gen. ii. 8; Lev. xvi. 14; Numbers ii. 3; Ps. lxvii. 33 (Sept.); Ezekiel xlv. 1-3, xlvi. 1, 2; Zechariah iii. 8, vi. 12 (Sept.); Malachi iv. 2; Matt. xxiv. 27; Luke i. 78.

PART II

CHAPTER I

PARTICULAR POINTS OF THE ORTHODOX RELIGION—
FREE-WILL—ORIGINAL SIN—REDEMPTION—
FAITH AND WORKS.

II—1

I SHALL now make use of the manuals under review for illustration of the teaching of the Greek Church upon the following points—(1) Free-will, as the basis of moral responsibility; (2) The hereditary transmission of the taint of sin; (3) The nature of Christ's Redemption; (4) The conditions of salvation—in other words, the part played* by right belief and good works respectively; (5) The Eucharist and Transubstantiation; (6) Confession and Penance; (7) Invocation of saints, and veneration of their pictures and relics; (8) The Intermediate State of the departed soul. In connection with the first point I shall have something to say about Predestination.

1. 'Could not GOD have restrained man by force from sinning ?

'He could have done so, being Almighty, but He would not, for, being the Perfection of Goodness, He had created man free and self-determining.

'Did GOD not foresee that man would sin ?

'He did, inasmuch as He foresees and foreknows all things, both good and evil. But GOD is not the cause of evil. The Devil is the cause, and man is at fault, who has power to refuse obedience to the Devil and avoid evil, and does not do so.'

Such is the teaching put forth in Bernardakis'

Catechism.¹ Moschakis and Kyriakos point out that freedom to choose the good and reject the evil, or *vice versa*, had to be bestowed on man, to the end that he might be a moral being at all, 'for virtue is of worth only when it is free and proceeds out of love for that which is good.' ²

'The image of God,' says Bishop Nektarios, 'was impressed upon the nature of the human soul itself. In other words, man was made like God in respect of his understanding and power of self-determination (τὸ αὐτεξούσιον). By this latter is meant the power of being made like God in moral excellence.' It is man's duty to develop the godlike endowments and attributes of his nature by the exercise of free-will or the power of determining his actions.³

Bishop Nektarios founds his teaching on that of S. John of Damascus, whom he cites at some length in a note.⁴ The Damascene distinctly asserts that God created man 'φύσει ἀναμάρτητον, καὶ θελήσει αὐτεξούσιον.' This natural sinlessness, however, did not exclude the possibility of sinning. Man was left free either to advance in the good way, co-operating with the grace of God, or to turn aside from that which is good, and occupy himself with evil, 'τοῦ Θεοῦ παραχωροῦντος διὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον. Οὐκ ἀρετὴ γὰρ τὸ βία γινόμενον.'⁵

¹ Bernardakis, p. 9.

² Moschakis, § 15; Kyriakos, § 21.

³ Nektarios, p. 45.

⁴ Note xiii. p. 233. The passage cited is from *F. O.* II. xii. 178 (cols. 921, 924).

⁵ S. John of Damascus also points out (*F. O.* II. xxv. 193) that if man is not αὐτεξούσιος and ἀρχὴ πράξεως, his powers of deliberation and decision are superfluous.

Divine Grace is the help which GOD freely gives, for the worthiness of Jesus Christ, to all who hear His Word, for their strengthening in mind, will, and heart for receiving the Christian Faith. Grace also continues to follow with the believer, to enable him to bring forth good works. But Divine Grace does not force men into the way of salvation. It does not suppress the *αὐτεξούσιον*. The sower, in the parable, sowed the seed, and GOD gave the sun and rain, but the crop depended upon the nature of the soil in which the seed was sown.¹ Moreover, Divine Grace is not absolute predestination. The Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination is a great error, for it destroys all responsibility. How can GOD call to account those whom from the first He has doomed to perdition? How can men be held responsible for sin and unbelief, of which they have become chargeable by GOD's own appointment? And how are others to be esteemed and praised for fruits of righteousness which they could not help bringing forth? Without his or her own consent, no human being is made perfect in goodness and love, nor attains to salvation. The unbelieving and ungodly shall be answerable for ungodliness and unbelief, for, had they willed it, they might have believed, they might have chosen the right and good way, and left the evil, perverse way. The Divine *πρόγνωσις*, foreknowledge, is

¹ Nektarios, p. 19. The Bishop cites the following apposite remarks from the Fathers: (1) ἡ χάρις, καθὼς χάρις ἦ, τοὺς ἐθέλοντας σώζει. —Chrysostom. (2) δεῖ καὶ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν εἶναι καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ τὸ σωθῆσθαι. —Gregory Nazianzen. (3) ὁ θεὸς πλάσας μόνος τὸν ἀνθρώπου ἀνευ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐ σώζει.

not absolute. Predestination is controlled by, does not control, God's knowledge and wisdom.¹

¹ Nektarios, p. 20: ὁ ἐκ τῆς προγνώσεως προορισμὸς ἀποκλείει τὸν ἀπόλυτον προορισμὸν.

Additional note upon Eastern Doctrine concerning Grace and Free-will.—In the collection of Canons called Τὸ Πηδάλιον, under the 124th Canon of the Council of Carthage (A.D. 418) are two notes bearing on this subject, from which I extract the following passages:—

(1) Ὁ Θεός, μόνος ἀγαθὸς ὢν, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτοαγαθότης, ἐποίησε καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀγαθόν. Δὲν ἠθέλησεν ὁμῶς καὶ νὰ τὸν καταναγκάσῃ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν . . . ἀλλὰ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν αὐτεξούσιον, καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἐδικήν του . . . ἦτοι, τοῦ ἔδωκε μίαν φυσικὴν δύναμιν μετὰ λόγου ὀρεκτικὴν . . . μετὰ τὴν ὅποίαν νὰ κινῆται εἰς τὸ καλὸν ὄχι ἡναγκασμένως καὶ βιαίως, ἀλλ' αὐτεξουσίως καὶ θεληματικῶς, φερόμενος εἰς αὐτὸ τόσον ἀπὸ τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον, ὁ ὅπολος ἔχει ἀντικείμενον του τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὅσον καὶ ἀπὸ τὴν ἔμφυτον θέλησιν, ἥτις ἔχει ἀντικείμενον τῆς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ὡς λέγει ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης, 'ἀγαθόν ἐστίν, οὐ πάντα ἐφίεται,' καὶ τοῦτο ἐφάνέρωσεν ὁ Σειράχ λέγων 'Αὐτὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐποίησε τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλλοῦ αὐτοῦ.'

(2) 'ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκτίσθη παρὰ Θεοῦ καὶ εἶναι αὐτεξούσιος, ἀλλὰ διὰ νὰ κινῆται εἰς μόνον τὸ καλόν, καὶ ὄχι καὶ εἰς τὸ κακόν, καὶ ἔχει δύναμιν καὶ ἐλευθερίαν εἰς τὸ νὰ κάμνῃ μόνα τὰ καλὰ ἔργα, καὶ ὄχι τὰ κακά.' The commentator argues that it is a sort of ἀδυναμία and ἀσθένεια, whereby men incline to evil, and he uses ἐλευθερία rather in the sense of ἀδεια.

(3) Distinct species of grace (χάρις). This note is taken from Koressios.

(α) **προκαταρκτικὴ** ἢ **φωτιστικὴ**. 'ἥτις πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις δίδεται, χωρὶς συνεργείας τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου'—described by Theophylactos thus: 'οἷόν τις ἐπιτηδεύτης ἐνετέθη τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος πρὸς τὸ τὸν ὄντως εἰδέναι Θεόν.'

(β) **χάρις ἐνδυναμοῦσα**—which strengthens the human will in the love of that which is good; not compelling, but gently persuading.

(γ) **χάρις συνεργούσα**—works with the man, helping him to accomplish good purposes, which without this help would not bear fruit in action.

(δ) **χάρις διαμένουσα καὶ δικαιούσα**—which makes a man abide in virtue and goodness to the end; imparted to those only who are fore-ordained to salvation (μόνοις κληρουμένη τοῖς προωρισμένοις).

(ε) **χάρις καθ' ἑξῆς**.—'εἰς βάθος ἐγκεκολλημένη τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ μένουσα . . . καὶ αὕτη μόνον τοῖς προωρισμένοις δίδεται. Basil the Great and Cyril of Alexandria compare it to art, which always exists in the artist, though not always and incessantly exercised and displayed.

2. The evil which Adam and Eve wrought upon themselves by their transgression infected their children, and the whole human race, sprung from them. ‘This malady has been called original sin (*προπατορικὸν ἁμάρτημα*). Both history and daily experience teach us that men naturally incline to evil, that they have become idolaters and corrupt.’¹

The Catholic belief, with regard to original sin, says Bishop Nektarios,² is that it is the cause of defective moral perception, and constant inclination to evil—an *ἐκτροπή τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου*, found in every human being, even in those who are ‘sanctified from their mother’s womb,’ including the Virgin Mary herself. The infection is a real one—*πραγματικὴ μετάδοσις*—it is not incurred by imitation. In every child that is born there is a taint of sin, which is really washed away in the laver of regeneration. This is a mystery—the reason of the fact is known to God only. But by way of making the mystery easier to grasp and retain, it is suggested that the infection of the whole race by

The three first, viz., *χάρις προκαταρκτική*, *χάρις ἐνδυναμοῦσα*, and *χάρις συνεργοῦσα*, are given to those who only remain steadfast for a season and then fall away from grace; but the two last—*χάρις δικαιοῦσα* and *χάρις καθ’ ἑξιν*—are imparted only to the fore-ordained, ‘ὡν τὸ αὐτεξούσιον μένει ἐδραῖον εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν.’ They are the seal of predestination, and are properly called the work and effect of predestination. [The *Πηδάλιον*, compiled by the monks Agapios and Nikodemos of the monastery of the Pantokrator on Mount Athos, and completed in 1793, was first printed at Leipsic (with authority of the Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople) in 1800. A second edition was issued at Athens in 1841, and a third in Zante in 1864.]

¹ Moschakis, § 15.

² In his Appendix, note 15, p. 257. This note is taken from Eugenios Bulgaris, and is to be found in the *Πηρὶ ἱλίου*, under Canon 121 of the Council of Carthage (A.D. 418).

the disobedience of one is due to the representative position of that one. The commandment given to Adam was not given to him only and exclusively, but to all his descendants, existing potentially in him, body and soul.¹ If Adam had obeyed the commandment concerning the Tree of Knowledge, he would have transmitted this obedience to his descendants, and with that obedience the blessedness which was the reward of it. But he disobeyed, and transmitted his disobedience with its attendant penalties, to the race sprung from his loins.² Mankind, sprung from him, disobeyed, in him and through him, the commandment, and broke the covenant made with him, but also through him with them all.

The Covenant of Eden was made with a representative individual, just as the Covenant of Circumcision was made with Abraham, and upon the conduct of that representative, in either case, depended the destiny of his descendants and successors. Although, therefore, infants have no sins of their own to repent and be purged of, when they are brought to the font, yet they are infected with the taint of the sin of their first forefather. Every human being is born in 'a state of sin,' and he or she becomes an actual sinner

¹ The potential existence of the bodies of Adam's descendants in Adam's body occasions no difficulty to the theologians who propose this explanation, but the potential existence of their souls in Adam's soul is disallowed. Their souls, says Bulgariis, were not latent in Adam's soul by any natural potentiality, ἀλλὰ συνθήκη τινί, ὡς ἀρχηγῶ καὶ γενάρχη, ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἀπασαι συνενοοῦντο ὅλων τῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ ψυχαί.

² So that obedience would have been carried on as a habit to Adam's descendants. But would the possibility of any of them sinning have been excluded?

as soon as ever self-consciousness is developed to the point at which self-assertion, and the manifestation of the opposition of one's own will to the Divine Will begins.¹ Original sin 'entails personal responsibility' (*i.e.* when it has broken out in act), and renders one liable to punishment.² It makes human beings unworthy of communion with God. Infants dying unbaptized are, in the judgment of Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory Nyssen, unworthy of the Divine communion, but not worthy of damnation. The opinion held by Augustine, that infants dying unbaptized are subjected to punishment in the next world, though very light punishment, is not countenanced by the Eastern Church, which holds that they abide in Hades until they receive the light of the Gospel.³

¹ Nektarios, Catechism, p. 55 (ἐρωταπόκρισις περὶ προπατορικοῦ ἁμαρτήματος).

² *Ibid.* Reference is made to Romans v. 12. Theophylact (quoted in Πηδάλιον, p. 525, and Nektarios, p. 240) observes on this passage: 'Πεσόντος ἐκείνου' (*sc.* Adam) 'οἱ μὴ φαγόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου γεγόνασιν ἐξ ἐκείνου θνητοί, ὡς ἂν καὶ αὐτοὶ πταίνοντες, διότι ἐκεῖνος ἔπταισεν.

³ Nektarios, *ibid.* In his Appendix (note 15), Nektarios, following Bulgaris, who again follows Jerome, finds proof of the doctrine of original sin in Hosea vi. 7. It should be noted, though, that the LXX rendering of that text is Αὐτοὶ δὲ (*sc.* Ephraim and Judah) εἰσιν ὡς ἄνθρωπος παραβαίνων διαθήκην. Jerome, however, understands 'Adam' (represented in the LXX text by ἄνθρωπος) as meaning the first forefather of the human race. The A.V. has, 'But they, like men, have transgressed the covenant.' The R.V. in its text has 'like Adam'; in the margin, 'are as men that have transgressed a covenant.' A much stronger citation from the O.T. would have been Ps. li. 5. This verse possibly has some connection with the following view: 'Ὁ ὕλικός τρόπος δέ, διὰ μέσου τοῦ ὁποίου τὸ προπατορικὸν αὐτὸ ἁμάρτημα μεταδίδεται, καλῶς οἱ θεολόγοι λέγουσιν ὅτι εἶναι ἡ ἐμπαθὴς καὶ φιλήδονος ῥύσις τοῦ σπέρματος, ἐξ οὗ συλλαμβανόμεθα. Δι' ὃ καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ὡς μὴ ἐκ σπέρματος γεννηθέντα, ἀνώτερον ὁμολογοῦμεν τοῦ προπατορικοῦ ἁμαρτήματος (Bulgaris, Πηδάλιον, pp. 525-26).

3. Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God,¹ became the Saviour of mankind, because He rescued the world from sin and error, reconciling mankind to God, from Whom they had been estranged by sin, and infusing amongst them and into them a new life and spirit, the spirit of truth and holiness. His saving power was exerted, (1) through His teaching, (2) through His example, and (3) through His sacrifice of Himself, on behalf of all mankind, upon the Cross.²

By sin, man became impotent to fulfil his Divinely appointed destiny, and was alienated from God. The Mosaic Law was the 'Lydian stone' which proved, in the person of the Jewish people, how corrupt human nature was, how impotent to realise in practice the

¹ In Bernardakis' Catechism (the most elementary of the four under review) the Orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation is very clearly stated to pupils. 'The Son of God, when He had become Man, still remained God, and so, being one and the same person, He was God-Man (*θεάνθρωπος*) or God and Man together (*ὁμοῦ*). He had two wills, even as He had two natures—one will as God, and another will as Man; but the human will was subject to the Divine. Some of His actions were Divine, and some were human. As Man, He wept for Lazarus, but He raised Him up as God. He suffered as Man, He rose again on the third day as God' (p. 12). After the Nativity, Mary remained a virgin, even as she was before (p. 11). Kyriakos says, 'The Wisdom or Word of God is also called in Holy Writ the Son of God, even as we might call a man's word or thought his offspring. The Wisdom or Word of God, then, . . . dwelt in its fulness in Christ, became Man in Him, or was incarnate (*ἐνώκησεν ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἐν αὐτῷ ἢ ἐνεσαρκώθη*).'² Then he refers to the principal heresies (of Arius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches) and their condemnation by the first four General Councils (§ 28). Nektarios (pp. 62, 63) sets forth the Orthodox doctrine of the Hypostatic Union and the *ἀντίδοσις τῶν ιδιωμάτων*, making special reference to the Canon or Dogma of the Sixth Oecumenical Council (A.D. 680, Canon 1 of Council in Trullo), and in a long note (No. 6, pp. 211-225) deals with the heresies from Simon Magus to the Iconoclasts.

² Kyriakos, § 29; Moschakis, §§ 17, 20, 21.

moral ideal contained in the Law. But GOD, of His mercy and lovingkindness, had in His eternal counsels appointed a way and means of removing the barriers which shut off mankind from communion with Him. This way and means was the mission of His Son for the salvation of the world. The Son of GOD—the Second Person of the Trinity, revealed in the Old Testament as Jehovah—became perfect man, and bore the sin of the world, and offered Himself up as a propitiatory sacrifice to GOD His Father, for the life and salvation of the whole world. This salvation the Church regards as a new creation, a regeneration and reformation (*ἀνάπλασις*) of the old, and the work of grace.

When the fulness of time came, GOD sent forth His Son, born of a woman. The Son of GOD, incarnate by the Holy Ghost of Mary the Virgin, was made in all things like unto us, save and except sin. As He was born, so He lived, ever sinless, and His sinlessness (*τὸ ἀναμάρτητον*) is the result of the personal or hypostatic union, in Him, of Manhood with Godhead.¹

Jesus Christ became the Mediator of the Covenant of Grace. For this He has received full authority from the Father (Matt. xxviii. 18; John v. 22, 25, etc.), and as Mediator He makes full reconciliation between GOD and men. The redemptive work which He has wrought in His 'theandric' character is threefold, consisting in (1) His work as the greatest of the Prophets; (2) His

¹ Nektarios, pp. 58-64, and 240-251, cf. 88-89, where note 'Περὶ τῆς Παρθένου Μαρίας πιστεύομεν καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν . . . ὅτι ἦτο πρὸ τόκου παρθένος καὶ ἐν τόκῳ παρθένος καὶ ὅτι μετὰ τόκον πάλιν παρθένος διέμεινε, διὸ καὶ ἀείπαις καλεῖται καὶ ἀειπαρθένος καὶ κατ' ἐξοχὴν Παρθένος.'

work as our Great High Priest; (3) His work as the King of Kings. His Messiahship is to be viewed under three aspects—the prophetic, the sacerdotal, and the regal.¹

(i) The principles of Christ's *teaching* are set forth as follows by M. Kyriakos:²—

1. GOD is our Father, and we are His children. Matt. vi. 9.
2. GOD being a Father Who is full of love towards us, we ought to love Him with a filial love. This love should be the mainspring of conduct, for virtue is without value, when it springs, not of love, but of fear or self-interest.
3. GOD pardons the penitent sinner. He is long-suffering (Matt. v. 45), and rejoices over the return of the sinner from his evil ways (Luke xv. 11-32).
4. Repentance, if real and true, must lead to our shaking ourselves loose from the chain of our sins, and purifying our hearts. 'Blessed are the pure in heart,' said Christ, 'for they shall see God' (Matt. v. 8). Repentance which finds no lasting practical expression avails nothing.
5. They who are by repentance and remission delivered and purified, constitute the kingdom of God in this world—*i.e.* a community in which GOD's law and will reign supreme. This kingdom of love and devotion to the holy will of GOD Christ came to found in the world, even as

¹ Nektarios, pp. 64-67.

² Kyriakos, § 30. Cf. Moschakis, § 22.

the prophets foretold.¹ Of this kingdom Christ speaks in His Parables and the Sermon on the Mount.

(ii) In His life, Jesus Christ confirmed His teaching by His perfect *example*.² He brought not only truth, but life also. His will was always to do the will of His Father. In Him all virtues were united harmoniously. Together with perfect devotion towards God He showed love and goodwill towards men, sharing their joys and sorrows. 'He did no sin, neither was any guile found in His mouth.' His adversaries confessed that He was 'true,' and taught 'the way of God' without respect of persons, and they were silent when He challenged them to convince Him of sin.³ He was the perfect type of piety and virtue, fulfilling blamelessly the law as He Himself had summed it up in the two great commandments, and at the last giving that which He Himself had declared to be the highest possible manifestation of human love.⁴

(iii) 'In the third place, Jesus Christ became the Saviour of the world by His *death*. The death of Jesus Christ not only set the seal upon His holy life, and made manifest His infinite love towards mankind: it served also as a sacrifice offered to God. By their sins, men provoked God's wrath and were alienated from Him. In vain did they seek to propitiate God and satisfy Divine

¹ In § 27 Kyriakos refers to Isaiah ii., ix., xi.; Jeremiah xxiii.; Ezekiel xi., xxxiv.; Micah iv.

² Kyriakos, § 33, referring to 1 Peter ii. 21.

³ Kyriakos, § 30, referring to 1 Peter ii. 22; Matt. xxii. 16; and John viii. 46. Moschakis, § 23.

⁴ Moschakis, § 23, referring to Matt. xxii. 37-39, and John xv. 13.

Justice with sacrifices of beasts and human creatures. These sacrifices were altogether outward things, a mere shadow and copy of the one true sacrifice (ἀπλὴ σκιά καὶ τύπος τῆς μόνης ἀληθοῦς θυσίας) which the sinless Jesus offered voluntarily upon the Cross, and through which we have been once more united (ἡνώθημεν) and reconciled to GOD. "Being enemies, we have been reconciled to GOD through the death of His Son." And since by His death Jesus has mediated between GOD and mankind and reconciled them (συνεφιλίωσεν αὐτούς), He is also for this reason called the Mediator. All those, then, who believe in Christ ought to *crucify*, that is, to overcome, their passions and evil lusts, to be dead for sin, and alive for goodness, for GOD.¹

(i) Christ, says Bishop Nektarios, was κατ' ἐξοχὴν προφήτης, for He was θεάνθρωπος, and the fountain of His teaching was the wisdom of GOD dwelling in Him. He spake of that which He had seen 'with the Father,' the truth which He had heard from GOD (John v. 38, 40, etc.). He proclaimed to men the eternal counsels of GOD and taught them the true faith, the worship of GOD in spirit, and saving works. He wrought miracles, and foretold future events, such as the destruction of Jerusalem, and the warfare and final triumph of Christianity. He is a Prophet for ever, for He still speaks in the Church through His ministers, who are His organs, enlightening them, and through them proclaiming and expounding Divine truths.

¹ Moschakis, § 24, quoting Romans v. 10. Compare Kyriakos, § 34, concluding 'Τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ταύτην ἀγάπην ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς νὰ ἀνταποδίδωμεν αὐτῷ, τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολάς του, καὶ ὄντες ἀφωσιωμένοι εἰς τὴν θείαν διδασκαλίαν του.'

(ii) As the *Great High Priest*, He offered Himself as a flawless victim to God the Father, a propitiatory sacrifice, He Himself being both Priest and Victim, whereby He propitiated and satisfied Divine Justice. He was the sinless Representative of the human race before God the Father, taking upon Himself all the punishment whereof mankind, having sinned, was worthy. His Blood, shed upon the Cross, sealed the New Covenant, which He made with the Father, through which every one is saved who believes in Him, and confesses the propitiatory merits of His death upon the Cross. The Aaronic high-priesthood was only the shadow of Christ's, as we learn from the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christ being a High Priest for ever, offers Himself eternally, a sacrifice for the life and salvation of the world, through the agency of His consecrated ministers, whom He has ordained (ἑτάξεν) in His Church, for in the Mystic Sacrifice He Himself is the sacrificer and the sacrificed, the receiver and the distributed (αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος, ὁ προσδεχόμενος καὶ διαδιδόμενος).

(iii) As the *King Eternal*, Christ founded upon earth the Kingdom of Heaven, immediately after His Ascension. His Kingdom upon earth is the Church, the foundation-day of which was the day of Pentecost, when Christ sent down His own Holy Spirit (τὸ πανάγιον Αὐτοῦ Πνεῦμα) upon His Apostles and disciples. As King, Jesus provides for and governs His Kingdom everlastingly through His consecrated ministers, and imparts, unceasingly and abundantly, the gifts of the Holy Spirit for its strengthening and extension. He

seals up vision and prophecy, and brings sacrifice and offering to an end (Daniel ix. 24). He sanctifies, consoles, and glorifies His people. He is their Law-giver, and by Him the nations have been called to believe in Him. As King, He requires obedience to His laws, obedience constant even in the face of death. He makes war upon iniquity, and gives peace to goodness. As the King eternal, He reigns in the hearts of His people. As King, He will judge the quick and the dead, and reward them all according to their works.

There are three aspects under which the throne of Jesus exalted is shown to us in Holy Writ—answering to the threefold relation in which He enters with His people and the world in general. His throne is (1) a throne of Grace; (2) a throne of Judgment; (3) a throne of Glory (Heb. i. 16; Rev. xx. 11-15; iv. 2-5, v. 6).¹

4. The things which a Christian ought to do are the Catechist's subject-matter no less than the things which a Christian ought to believe. It is the Catechist's function to instruct others in religion, and religion 'is not mere knowledge, but has its roots in the heart. True religion is shown by good works.'² Catechumens therefore must learn not only what they are to believe, but also how they are to worship God and execute His will and commandments in their daily lives, and an integral part of every Orthodox Catechism is Χριστιανική Ἠθική, just as much as Χριστιανική Δογματική and Ἱεροτελεστική.³ The Church is appointed as the sphere of

¹ Nektarios, pp. 67-74.

² Moschakis, § 2.

³ See, for examples, the synopsis of the contents of the four Catechisms under review, p. 12, *supra*.

man's regeneration, not only through the imparting of the mere knowledge of the Creed, but also through that of the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments,—not only through the teaching of Sacred History, but also through the teaching of religious duty, and the encouragement of religious practice. Justification or regeneration does no more than begin with repentance and faith—the steadfast resolve to forsake sin and the rendering of allegiance, trustfully and hopefully, to Christ. It is completed through sanctification or good works.¹ Our faith in Christ, which is our confidence in Him and hearty devotion to Him, is indeed the indispensable beginning, but it is not a living and true faith, except it be manifested in our lives, through good works, and bear in us the fruit of sanctification. By sanctification is meant that state of a man in which he has no desire to do aught that is contrary to the will of God, but strives to make his actions, as far as he can, conformable to that will. It is, therefore, an integral part of justification or regeneration. When S. Paul says that a man is justified by faith, he means the living faith which is manifested through works of love. Sanctification is gradual. None can say that he has attained to perfect holiness, but we must for all that strive towards the attainment of the moral perfection which is the end

¹ Kyriakos, § 38, also § 37 towards the end: 'Ἡ δικαίωσις ἡ ἀναγέννησις ἀρχεται μόνον διὰ τῆς μετανοίας καὶ πίστεως, συμπληροῦται δὲ διὰ τοῦ ἀγιασμοῦ ἢ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων.' 'Πίστις εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν δὲν σημαίνει ἀπλῶς τὸ νὰ γινώσκῃ τις τὰ κατὰ τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν του, ἀλλὰ συνάμα καὶ νὰ ᾔναι τις ἀπὸ καρδίας ἀφωσιωμένος εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν του.'

of sanctification, making it our ideal. S. Paul exhorted his disciples to 'abound in the work of the Lord,' but his own opinion of himself was that he had not attained to the consummation he longed for.¹ Good works mean, not only Baptism, Penance, and Communion, and observance of festivals and fasts, but also prayer and thanksgiving, mercy and justice, bridling the tongue, suppressing evil passions. And by mercy are meant such works as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick and prisoners, protecting and entertaining strangers, burying the dead, admonishing and reclaiming sinners, teaching the ignorant, intercession with GOD for the sins, sorrows, and necessities of our fellow-creatures, comforting the afflicted.²

The Church requires faith of those who come to be baptized, because only through faith in Christ lies the way of salvation. This faith in Christ, which is the only defence whereby a man may be justified, is the confession of Christ as our Redeemer, and of the mercy and grace of GOD, and a hearty and steadfast resolution to bear the yoke of Christ and keep His Divine commandments. Concerning this faith which justifies, the teaching of the Church is that it is the common work of grace Divine, calling and energising, and of the human will, obeying the call, and co-operating. Grace Divine is the assistance bestowed by GOD, for the worthiness of Christ, strengthening the mind and heart and will of the believer to receive the Christian faith, and continu-

¹ Kyriakos, § 38.

² Bernardakis, pp. 28, 44, 45. Ὁ Χριστιανὸς διὰ τὴν σωθῆναι, δὲν ἀρκεῖ μόνον τὴν ἔχῃ πίστιν, δὲν ἀρκεῖ τὴν μεταλαμβάνει ἀπὸ τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ ἀρχοντα μυστήρια, ἀλλὰ πρέπει καὶ τὴν ζῆν συμφώνως μετὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ.

ing to support and stimulate him to the performance of good works.¹ A man ought to be virtuous, ἐνάρητος, which means a doer of good works, because it is his duty to put on the likeness of GOD, and through the works of righteousness this likeness is fixed in him. Righteousness is the effect of activity (ἐνέργεια) in conformity to the moral law.²

¹ Nektarios, p. 19.

² *Ibid.* pp. 158-160.

PART II (*continued*)

CHAPTER II

THE EUCHARIST AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION—CONFESSION
AND PENANCE—INVOCATION OF SAINTS—ICONS AND
RELICS—THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

II—II

5. 'THE third Sacrament (*μυστήριον*) is the Eucharist, which is also called the Communion.'¹ 'The Eucharist is a Sacrament, in which we partake of the very Body and Blood of Christ. Great is the mystery of the Eucharist, for it represents (*ἀναπαριστᾷ*) Jesus' death, and the sacrifice which He made on our behalf upon the Cross, and by its means we are made one (*ἐνούμεθα*) with Jesus.'² 'The Eucharist is that sacred rite in which we believe that, partaking of bread and wine, we receive the communion (*κοινωνοῦμεν*) of the very Body and Blood of the Lord, and are made one (*ἐνούμεθα*) with Him, whilst at the same time we renew the memory (*ἀναμνησκόμεθα*) of His death for us. This Sacrament was ordained by the Lord Himself, as Paul recounts (1 Cor. xi. 23-26). . . . According to these words of Paul, the Eucharist represents (*ἀναπαρίστησι*) to us, in deed and in truth

¹ Bernardakis, p. 23. There are two Greek words which may be rendered by 'Communion,' viz., *μετάληψις* (participation) and *κοινωνία*. Both are here used by M. Bernardakis. In the *Horologion* (Venice ed., p. 458 f.) there is the *Ἀκολουθία τῆς Ἁγίας Μεταλήψεως*, which consists of an office of preparation, *secreta* to be said at the moment of Communion, and thanksgiving after Communion. This *Ἀκολουθία* is also found in the abridged *Euchologion* called the *Agiasmatarion* (a parish priest's pocket-book). The term *μετάληψις*, therefore, is a recognised term for use in speaking of the Eucharist.

² Moschakis, § 40.

(πραγματικῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς) the very death and sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the Cross.’¹

Such are the answers to the question, ‘What is the Eucharist?’ given in the Catechisms of MM. Bernardakis, Moschakis, and Kyriakos. In none of them, nor in that of Bishop Nektarios, is there any mention of μετασυσίωσις or transubstantiation.² M. Bernardakis’ Catechism supplies the following answer to the question, ‘How is this Sacrament administered, and how do Christians partake of it?’—‘The priest takes bread and wine, with water, which through the prayers of the priest and the supplications of the Church are changed (μεταβάλλονται) by the operation of the Holy Ghost (διὰ τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος), and the bread becomes (γίνεται) the Body of Christ, and the wine His Blood. In such wise the Christian partakes of the very Body and Blood of Christ, albeit the Holy Communion (ἡ ἁγία κοινωνία) has the taste, not of flesh and blood, but of bread and wine.’³ The benefits of the Holy Communion are very clearly and forcibly stated in the same Catechism. ‘The Christian, partaking of the holy Body and Blood of Christ becomes one with Him, and so obtains possession of the mightiest weapon against the devil and sin, and is sanctified and strengthened for the doing of good works, well-pleasing to God.’⁴ Proceeding, M. Bernar-

¹ Kyriakos, § 49.

² This statement must not be taken as implying that the Eastern Orthodox Church does not accept and teach the theory of Transubstantiation. See Appendix, p. 66.

³ Bernardakis, p. 24. μεταβάλλονται.—Cf. μεταποιούνται in S. John Damasc. *De Fide Orthodoxa*, iv. xiii. col. 1144-45. Note the special mention of the mixed chalice.

⁴ *Ibid.*

dakis teaches his pupils that every Christian ought to communicate at least four times a year, namely, at Christmas, Easter, and on the Festivals of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29), and the Dormition of the Blessed Virgin (August 15), having observed the previous fasts in each case.¹

‘The Eucharist,’ says Bishop Nektarios,² ‘is the Christian’s spiritual food, which quickens the soul, and brings a man into immediate communion (ἐπικοινωνίαν) with our Saviour Christ, for he who communicates receives, under the form (εἶδος) of bread and wine, the very precious Body and the very precious Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and is mystically made one with Him. The Eucharist is for health of soul and body, for remission of sins and life eternal.’³ It is called the Eucharist, because Christ delivered this Sacrament to His disciples with thanksgiving, when He gave thanks, and brake the bread.⁴ The Christian who receives the Holy Communion ought to believe that under the forms (εἶδη) of bread and

¹ Bernardakis, p. 25. The fast preceding the Festival of SS. Peter and Paul varies in length, according as Easter falls early or late. It begins on the Monday following All Saints’ Day, which the Greek Orthodox keep on the 2nd Sunday after Pentecost. In a note on p. 174 of his Catechism, Bishop Nektarios says, ‘The primitive Christians used to communicate at every celebration of the Liturgy, then they communicated weekly, and subsequently on the rarer occasions of the chief festivals. Finally, by the Church’s dispensation they were allowed a minimum of four times a year. Those, however, who are worthy may communicate more frequently.’

² Nektarios, p. 172.

³ γίνεται δὲ ἡ εὐχαριστία εἰς ὑγίειαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Cf. the prayer of S. Chrysostom in the Ἀκολουθία τῆς Μεταλήψεως.—Horologion, p. 470.

⁴ Nektarios, *l.c.*

wine he is partaking of the very Body and Blood of the Lord.¹ Christ delivered this Sacrament to His Church, to preserve, administer, and celebrate throughout the ages, and His words, 'Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν,' signify the perpetual memory (ἀδιάλειπτος μνήμη) of the Incarnation (ἔνσαρκος οἰκονομία) of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour, and of His saving Passion, of the great benefits wrought for us in the Redemption, and the eternal blessings, whereof we have been deemed worthy to be participators, in the Kingdom of God.'²

To deny the sacrificial character of the Eucharist is an error into which Protestants have fallen.³ The Eucharist stands in the very closest relation to the death of Christ upon the Cross. By the hands of His ministers, whom He has ordained in His Church, Christ offers Himself throughout the ages, a sacrifice for the deliverance and life of the world. In the mystic sacrifice of the Eucharist, He Himself offers and is offered up, He it is Who receives and is distributed.⁴

'From the time of the Apostles the Eucharist began to be administered with ordinary bread. The Scriptures agree without exception in recording that the Lord took *bread*. Furthermore, the consecrated wine was given to all, without exception. "Drink ye *all* of it," said our Lord, when He ordained this Sacrament. This ordinance has been altered by the Western Christians, who have introduced unleavened in the

¹ Nektarios, p. 173.

³ Kyriakos, § 49.

² *Ibid.*

⁴ Nektarios, p. 72.

place of ordinary bread, and do not impart of the cup to the laity. The Protestants have restored the cup to the laity, and they have also brought in the use of ordinary bread. As in the Church of ancient times, so in ours, to this day, the Eucharist is the centre and life of public worship. This custom also the Protestants have changed, for they celebrate the Eucharist but rarely.¹ The Eucharist is celebrated every day, with the exception of certain fixed days. A celebration every Sunday is indispensable, Sunday being the commemoration of the Lord's Resurrection, and the like rule applies to Festivals of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the Saints.²

¹ Kyriakos, § 49. In a note appended to § 49, Professor Kyriakos gives in outline a description of the Eucharistic rite of the Orthodox Church. In the view of every Orthodox Christian, Liturgy means administration of the Lord's Supper. No Communion, no Liturgy. The Divine Liturgy, then, includes five essential parts—i. Lectures from the Epistles and Gospels. ii. Preaching, in which these passages of Scripture are expounded. iii. Prayers and Hymns. iv. Consecration of the Eucharist. v. Recitation of the Credo and Paternoster. M. Kyriakos gives the text of the principal Eucharistic hymns, and altogether his note on the Liturgy ought to be of great value for conveying to children's minds a definite idea of what the Eucharist is, and enabling them to understand what is being done, when they are present at the service. Bernardakis (pp. 21, 22) supplies definitions of the terms *τελετή* and *ἀκολουθία*. By *τελετή* are meant—'ὅλαι αἱ ἱεραὶ πράξεις, καθὼς καὶ αἱ προσευχαὶ καὶ αἱ δεήσεις τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν, μὲ τὰς ὁποίας συνοδεύεται ἡ τέλεσις τῶν μυστηρίων.' *Ἀκολουθία* means—'τὸ σύνολον τῶν προσευχῶν καὶ δοξολογιῶν ὅσας ἀναγινώσκουν ἢ ψάλλον πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ ψάλται.' The principal *ἀκολουθίαι*, which all Christians ought to attend, are the Hesperinos (Vespers), which is the *προεισαγωγή τῆς λειτουργίας* (Kyriakos, *l.c.*), the Orthros (Matins), which is the *εἰσαγωγή τῆς λειτουργίας* (Kyriakos), and the *λειτουργία*, which follows the Orthros.

² Bernardakis, p. 22. M. Bernardakis assigns to the congregation the hardest part in the service: 'οἱ λοιποὶ χριστιανοὶ παρακολουθοῦν τὰς εὐχὰς τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τὰς δοξολογίας τῶν ψαλτῶν προσευχόμενοι νοερώς.'

6. 'He who comes to receive the Eucharist, must be duly prepared, and must have examined himself, for how can any one seek to be made one with Christ, when his conscience is burdened with the guilt of heinous sins? Thus Paul says that a man must examine himself, etc. (1 Cor. xi. 28, 29). Penance, therefore, must precede the partaking of the Eucharist.'¹

None can be saved, except he partake of the Eucharist. But as the benefit of communion is great to such as partake worthily, *i.e.* in fear, faith, and love, so is the harm great to such as partake unworthily. Before communion, then, a man ought to examine himself, to see what sins can be laid to his charge, and lament over them, and steadfastly resolve not to return to them. Then he ought to go to his spiritual father, confess his sins to him, and declare his penitence. No emotion of fear or shame is to be allowed to cause the concealment of the smallest detail. If the penitent's sins be light and venial, his spiritual father pardons them (*τὰς συγχωρεῖ*) and gives him permission to come to the Communion. If the sins be grave and heinous, the penitent is forbidden to come, until he shall have performed the penances imposed by the minister.

'In the Mystery of Penance, the penitent, confessing his sins and sincerely repenting of them, invokes the mercy of God and receives pardon of his sins, through the priest, from God (*λαμβάνει διὰ τοῦ ἱερέως ἀπὸ τὸν Θεὸν τὴν συγχώρησιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν του*). The priest receives authority and permission (*ἄδεια*) to grant

¹ Kyriakos, *l.c.*

pardon of sins, from the Bishop, who has received it, by succession, from the Apostles, who in their turn received this power from Jesus Christ Himself.' ¹

This Sacrament is mentioned in the New Testament, Acts xix. 18, where it is recorded that 'many that believed came and confessed, and shewed their deeds.'² It is a renewal of the mystic cleansing received in Baptism.³ 'The sinner cannot be delivered from his sin, so long as he does not recognise it as such, and repent of it. Repentance, contrition, alone wipes out the stain of sin and reconciles man to GOD (καταλλάσσει καὶ συμφιλιοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον πρὸς τὸν Θεόν). The confessor (ὁ ἐν τῇ τελετῇ τῆς μετανοίας παρὼν πνευματικός) advises the penitent as to the way in which he may amend hereafter, and, declaring in Christ's Name that GOD grants remission of sins to penitent sinners, consoles and strengthens him. The Protestants at first rejected confession. Subsequently they reintroduced it, but only in a general form, made by the whole congregation before communion.'⁴

¹ Bernardakis, p. 25, 26. With regard to the obligation of making a particular, detailed confession, see Euchologion, p. 222 (rubric in the Ἀκολουθία τῶν ἐξομολογουμένων), 'Καὶ ἐρωτᾷ αὐτὸν ὁ Πνευματικὸς εἰς πάντα τὰ ἁμαρτήματα· καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐρωτῆσαι καταλεπτῶς, λέγει ταῦτα.' By ταῦτα is meant the form of Absolution, which is precatory ('ὁ Θεὸς συγχωρήσαι σοι').

² Kyriakos, § 50. Moschakis, § 41, cites James v. 16 as the Scriptural evidence and warrant for confession to the priest.

³ So have I ventured to interpret Bishop Nektarios' words in the answer to the question, 'What is Penance?'—'Μυστήριον δι' οὗ, ὡς λουτροῦ νέον, καθαρίζεται ὁ μετανοῶν' (p. 175). Cf. 'Βάπτισμά ἐστι τὸ λουτρὸν τῆς παλιγγενεσίας, δι' οὗ ὁ βαπτιζόμενος . . . καθαρίζεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥύπου τῆς προπατορικῆς καὶ προαιρετικῆς ἁμαρτίας,' and again, 'Τὰ ἀγιάζοντα τὸν βεβαπτισμένον μυστήρια καὶ ἄγοντα αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τελείωσιν, εἰσὶ τὸ μῦρον ἧτον τὸ χρίσμα, ἡ εὐχαριστία, καὶ ἡ μετάνοια' (pp. 169, 170).

⁴ Kyriakos, § 50. The special designation of the priest who receives

Penitence is manifested in fasting, which means limiting oneself to the scantiest diet. In ancient times, Christians used to fast before Easter, some for a week, others for several weeks, until the present term of Lent was appointed as the rule. Later on other fasts were added, viz., those which severally precede Christmas, the Festival of SS. Peter and Paul, and the Dormition of the Blessed Virgin.¹

7. 'Prayer is directed properly to GOD, but even though we also pray to the Saints, we do this, not because we look upon them as a sort of gods, able of themselves to help us—far from us be such blasphemy!—but because we believe that, as friends of GOD by reason of their sanctity and moral purity, they intercede with Him on our behalf, even as we who are still in the land of the living pray for one another, and may ask for one another's supplications.'²

Such is M. Kyriakos' defence of the Invocation of Saints. He shows plainly enough that it *need* not be a form of idolatry. But he does not prove that, as actually practised, it is not a survival of polytheism. Granting that the invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints was originally practised under the moderating influence of the considerations advanced by M. Kyriakos, it cannot be denied that the practice has degenerated.

confessions and pronounces absolution is πνευματικός or πνευματικός πατήρ. Authority to receive confessions is conferred in a special service. *Vide* Euchologion, pp. 220, 221.

¹ Kyriakos, note on § 50.

² Kyriakos, § 44 (p. 88). Moschakis, § 33: 'τοῦτο πράττομεν, ὅχι διότι θεοποιούμεν αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μεταχειρισθῶμεν αὐτούς ὡς μεσίτας παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.' Bernardakis, p. 34.

M. Kyriakos' own Catechism suggests the reason. In § 43 of his Catechism he points out that preaching (τὸ κήρυγμα ἢ ἡ διδασκαλία τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) is one of the principal means by which the Church works out the salvation of men, and that in the primitive assemblies of the faithful the rule was that the reading of Holy Scripture should be followed by exposition (delivered by the Bishop, or a Presbyter, or some other person licensed by the Bishop) of the passages which had been read.¹ Having thus called attention to the practice of the primitive Church, which regarded the public teaching of Christian truth and Christian duty out of the Scriptures as a most important part of public worship, M. Kyriakos proceeds: 'And nowadays every child of Christian parents ought, without exception or dispensation, to be catechised, and learn what are his duties as a Christian, and at the time of public worship preaching ought to come in to complete the catechetical instruction imparted privately or in school. The lack of catechetical instruction and preaching makes Christians indifferent to religion and ungodly, or else it engenders prejudices and superstitious notions, and entails the perversion of the true Christian religion.'

The Catechisms under review in this paper are so many proofs of the fact that the authorities of the Greek Orthodox Church have, to some extent at least, realised that in time past there has been a great and injurious want of religious instruction in their com-

¹ Kyriakos, § 40 (p. 82): 'Ὡς σπουδαιότατον μέρος τῆς λατρείας ἐθεωρεῖτο πάντοτε τὸ κήρυγμα ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναγινωσκομένων περικοπῶν τῶν Ἀγίων Γραφῶν, καθὼς μαρτυρεῖ ὁ Ἰουστίνος (Α' Ἀπολ. 67).'

munion, and that they are making some attempt to remedy the evil. But it takes a long time to undo the results of many centuries of neglect. And it is not only the ignorant and unlettered who have fallen into error. Let any one read what Nicolas Bulgaris, a learned Greek ecclesiastic of the seventeenth century, has written in praise of the Blessed Virgin in his *Holy Catechism*, and he will find such a celebration of her powers and perfections as is hardly to be distinguished from apotheosis.¹

The Orthodox Eastern Church does not allow any use of *ἀγάλματα* or *ἀνδριάντες*, i.e. figures in the round, and blames the Roman Church for sanctioning their erection in its houses of prayer. The Seventh Act of the Second Council of Nicaea (A.D. 787) expressly mentions pictures executed in paint upon stone or wood, in mosaic, and in embroidery upon vestments, or chased or carved in the material of sacred vessels, but it makes no mention of figures in the round, and this silence is construed as prohibition. Besides this interpretation of the conciliar decree, another reason, supplementary to it, is assigned, viz., that figures in the round present too close a resemblance to heathen idols, to be fit ornaments of Christian churches.²

¹ See the English translation of Bulgaris' *Holy Catechism*, by the Rev. W. E. Daniel, pp. 209-211 (London, J. Masters and Co.).

² See the *Πηγάδιον*, p. 314, note 6. *Εἰκόνες* are distinguished from *εἶδωλα* in that the former portray real and actual persons or things, whilst the latter are representations of persons or things that do not exist, such as the *ψευδεῖς καὶ ἀνύπαρκτοι θεοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων*. By *ἀγάλματα* and *ἀνδριάντες* are meant representations 'which contain the whole body of the thing represented.' The words of the Seventh Act of the Second Nicene Council, to which special reference is made, are,

By the term *εἰκών*, then, the Orthodox Church means a portrait executed in the flat, being a painting or mosaic, or in relief, or in needlework upon some textile fabric, and these *εἰκόνες* may be set up, not only in churches, but in private houses also, or in the streets and other public places. Thus the word *εἰκών* carries a wider denotation than 'picture,' since it is equally applicable to portraits painted upon wood or canvas, and the embossed figures upon chalices and patens, and the silver or brass bindings of Gospel-books.

The Catechism of M. Bernardakis contains clear statements as to the various ways in which the Second Commandment may be violated. To pray 'mechanically or in pretence,' that is, with the lips only, and not with the heart, or so as to be 'seen of men' in order to acquire a reputation for sanctity: to fast in outward performance only, abstaining merely from certain kinds of food whilst the heart is left still polluted by evil thoughts and passions: to render Divine honours to earthly principalities, authorities, and powers—obeying

'Ὅρίζομεν σὺν ἀκριβείᾳ πάσῃ καὶ ἐμμελείᾳ παραπλησίως τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ Σταυροῦ ἀνατίθεσθαι τὰς σεπτὰς καὶ ἁγίας εἰκόνας τὰς ἐκ χρωμάτων ἢ ψηφίδος καὶ ἐτέρας ὕλης ἐπιτηδεύειας ἐχούσης, ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις, ἐπὶ ἱεροῖς σκεύεσι καὶ ἐσθῆσι, τοίχοις τε καὶ σανίσιν, οἴκοις τε καὶ ὁδοῖς, [τῆς τε] τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [εἰκόνας], καὶ τῆς ἀχράντου Δεσποίνης ἡμῶν, τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου, τιμίων τε Ἀγγέλων καὶ πάντων Ἀγίων' (Πηδάλιον, p. 316). Mr. Tozer (*The Church and the Eastern Empire*, p. 125) thinks that the Orthodox prohibition of statues and crucifixes constitutes 'a distinct departure from the principles laid down by the Seventh General Council' in A.D. 787, but that this departure was made very gradually, the history of the process being now lost beyond recovery. (The bracketed words in the quotation given above ought either to be ejected as superfluous, or replaced by *τὰς τε—εἰκόνας*.)

men rather than GOD: to worship rank, fame, and wealth: to worship oneself, indulging the bodily lusts and appetites and giving a free rein to pride, covetousness, etc.—all these things are enumerated by M. Bernardakis as offences against the Second Commandment.¹ They also are idolaters, according to Bishop Nektarios, who set up idols in their hearts and abandon all love and veneration of GOD, or deify Nature or themselves, trusting in themselves, their riches, their powers of mind or body, or cherish superstitions.²

The veneration of icons, however, is not a breach of the Second Commandment, so long as it is practised with distinct recognition of the fact that, as S. Basil said, the honour rendered to the portrait ascends to the original. Those who deify icons and worship them as Divine, sin against the law, for we ought to honour these things simply as the representations of venerable personages, even as we honour any portrait or representation of one whom we love and revere. ‘The Church expressly teaches that worship (*λατρεία*) is due to GOD alone, but to icons no more than simple honour and reverence (*τιμητική προσκύνησις*). We have icons in our churches for the purpose of adornment, for evoking in us the remembrance of the holy persons whom they represent, and for the instruction of the ignorant by their means as out of books.’³

The Second Commandment prohibits the tendering of

¹ Bernardakis, p. 35.

² Nektarios, p. 101.

³ Kyriakos, § 60; Moschakis, § 50. ‘Pictures (*εἰκόνες*) are the books of the unlettered,’ said S. John of Damascus (*Oratio de Imaginibus*, i. col. 1248).

any sign of honour or reverence towards representations of gods which are no gods at all, such representations being *idols*. But an icon of our Saviour Christ is not an idol. It is the representation of Him in Whom God was made manifest in visible presence. Reverence paid to the icon is really paid to Him Who is portrayed in it.¹ The icons of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the Saints are means of raising our thoughts to the true God, Who has given glory to all who have worshipped Him and given themselves to Him in faith, hope, and love. Seeing, then, that this is the use of icons, that they raise our thoughts to God, to reverence them is not contrary to the Second Commandment, but fully in accordance with the spirit of it, and therefore is allowed.²

Besides pictures or portraits of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints, Crosses and Gospel-books are objects of *τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις*.³

The distinction between *τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις* and *λατρεία* is not one that is likely to present itself very clearly to the general mind. In these Catechisms,

¹ One might say that reverence and obeisance done *before* the icon is done *to* the person therein portrayed and represented.

² ἄρα ἡ προσκύνησις τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων ἐπιτρέπεται.—Nektarios, p. 102. It is not spoken of, however, in any of these Catechisms as a *necessary* part of Christian practice.

³ Seventh Act of the Second Council of Nicaea (Πηδάλιον, p. 317): "Ὅσῳ γὰρ συνεχῶς δι' εἰκονικῆς ἀνατυπώσεως ὀρῶνται, τοσοῦτον καὶ οἱ ταύτας θεώμενοι διανίστανται πρὸς τὴν τῶν πρωτοτύπων μνήμην τε καὶ ἐπιπόθησιν. Καὶ ταύταις ἀσπασμόν, καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονέμειν, οὐ μὴν τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, ἥ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θείᾳ φύσει, ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ Σταυροῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις Εὐαγγελίοις, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναθήμασι, καὶ θυμαμάτων, καὶ φώτων προσαγωγῇ πρὸς τὴν τούτων τιμὴν ποιεῖσθαι, καθὼς καὶ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις εἶθισται."

τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις is defined, though imperfectly, as *not* being deification or apotheosis. It is difficult to understand how any one, not being a very backward savage, could regard the painted picture or mosaic as in itself Divine. But he might readily regard it as instinct with supernatural life and power; and this is exactly the idea of an icon which the stories of miracles wrought by their means are adapted to suggest and foster. Moreover, the invocation of Saints must tend to confuse the distinction between the τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις due to them and the λατρεία exclusively due to God, and so must react upon the popular ideas and beliefs respecting icons. The invocations and laudations addressed to the Virgin Mary would exert a powerful influence upon the treatment of her portraits.

However, these Catechisms testify to a desire felt by Greek Church authorities, and acted upon, to rectify the popular practice and ideas in connection with icons, without abandoning a custom which undoubtedly is of considerable antiquity, and has been for a long while regarded as an Apostolic tradition.¹

¹ 'οὕτω γὰρ κρατύνεται ἡ τῶν ἁγίων Πατέρων ἡμῶν διδασκαλία, ἣτον παραδόσις τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, τῆς ἀπὸ περάτων εἰς πέρατα δεξαμένης τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.'—Seventh Act of the Second Council of Nicaea.

I have found no express mention of *relics*—i.e. of such objects as skulls, bones, teeth, etc., of saints—in these Catechisms. However, it will be readily understood that the principle 'ἡ τῆς εἰκόνης τιμὴ πρὸς τὸ πρῶτότυπον διαβαίνει,' if it avails for the veneration of pictures, should avail with tenfold force for the veneration of the bodily remains or personal effects of the martyrs, confessors, and doctors of the Church. According to the seventh Canon of the Second Nicene Council, the deposition of a martyr's relics within a church is indispensably required for its proper consecration, and a Bishop who consecrates a

8. The soul, when separated from the body in death, passes into an intermediate state of existence, which lasts till the Second Advent of our Lord. In this intermediate state the souls of the righteous enjoy a certain measure of happiness, which is a foretaste of the bliss which is to come, whilst the souls of the ungodly undergo punishment according to their sins.

The doctrine of purgatorial fire has never been recognised or admitted in the Eastern Church. It was exalted into the position of a necessary article of belief by Gregory the Great. But it had already received the countenance of Augustine, who had adopted it from Origen.¹

In the Old Testament the Intermediate State is spoken of as 'Sheol.' This word is also used to denote the grave, the receptacle of the lifeless body, but its principal use is to denote the place which receives the spirits of the dead, without any explicit reference to the separation of the righteous from the ungodly. The idea generally conveyed by it is that of a region of darkness and gloom in the lowest parts of the earth.²

The Synod of Jerusalem (A.D. 1672), whose definition

church without relies is to be deposed as having departed from the traditions of the Church.

S. John of Damascus attributes an immanence of the Holy Ghost to the icons and entombed bodies of Saints: 'Οἱ γὰρ ἅγιοι καὶ ζῶντες πεπληρωμένοι ἦσαν Πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ τελευτησάντων αὐτῶν, ἡ χάρις τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἀνεκφοιτήτως ἔνεστι καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἐν τοῖς τάφοις καὶ τοῖς χαρακτῆρσι καὶ ταῖς ἁγίαις εἰκόσιν αὐτῶν, οὐ κατ' οὐσίαν, ἀλλὰ χάριτι καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ.'—*De Imaginibus Orat.* i. cap. 19, col. 1249.

¹ Nektarios, p. 54.

² *Ibid.* pp. 53, 54.

concerning the state of departed souls is cited at length by Bishop Nektarios,¹ pronounced as follows:—

‘We believe that the souls of the dead are either at rest or in misery, each according to its works, for [we believe that] when they are separated from their bodies they depart either into a place of joy or into a place of grief and groaning. But we confess that they obtain the fulness and perfection neither of joy nor of condemnation. After the general resurrection, when the soul shall be united with the body in which it has lived, whether for good or evil, each one shall receive the complete and final award, whether it be of bliss or of condemnation.

‘As for those who have corrupted themselves with deadly sins, yet have not departed this life in desperation, but have repented whilst still abiding in the life of the body, though without bringing forth any fruit of their repentance (such as weeping, prostration, self-affliction in long watching with prayer, almsgiving, and steadfast manifestation of love towards GOD and one’s neighbour in good works), we believe that their souls pass away into Hades, and endure punishment according to, and for, the sins they have committed. We believe also that they are conscious of deliverance from that place, and that they are released by GOD’S goodness, in answer

¹ Nektarios, note on p. 53. Compare the declaration of the Synod of Nicosia (Cyprus) held in 1668: ‘We declare boldly that they who abolish the benefactions and offerings made on behalf of those who have fallen asleep in faith and penitence, and the like good works, and who deny that these things are of avail to souls suffering in the prohibition and delay of their entrance into bliss, for remission and shortening of the delay, are to be judged strangers indeed to the portion of the true believers (ἀλλότριον τῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων μερίδος), and transgressors of the traditions received from the Apostles and the Fathers.’ (Cited in a note on p. 97 of P. Georgiou’s *Εἰδήσεις Ἱστορικαὶ περὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Κύπρου*.)

to the prayers of priests, and the benefactions done in the name of the departed by their kinsfolk. Of especial avail towards this release is the bloodless sacrifice, offered by each one severally for his departed kinsfolk, and by the Church Catholic on behalf of all in general, every day. But it must be understood withal that we know not the time of the soul's release. That souls departed as aforesaid [*i.e.* penitent, but imperfectly] are released from their sufferings, and that this release takes place before the general resurrection and judgment, we believe; but the time of their release we know not.'

To enter upon any discussion of the belief in the efficacy of the prayers and offerings of the living for the dead would be foreign to the proper purpose of this review. But it must be allowed by all that the teaching of the Orthodox Greek Church, in so far as it asserts that the souls of the departed 'do neither die with their bodies nor sleep idly,' and that retribution commences between death and the judgment, is in full and thorough agreement with 'the right belief declared to us in Holy Scripture.'¹

¹ See Luckock, *After Death*, ch. iii. (p. 29, first edition).

APPENDIX

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION

I. ORTHODOX CONFESSION OF FAITH (A.D. 1643).

Quest. 56. [Exposition of the words of the Nicene Creed : ‘ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father.’]—Τέταρτον διδάσκει, πῶς ὁ Χριστὸς εἶναι μόνον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ὄχι εἰς τὴν γῆν κατὰ τὸν τρόπον τῆς σαρκός, ὅπου ἐφόρεσε, καὶ συνανεστράφηκεν εἰς τὴν γῆν· μὰ κατὰ τὸν μυστηριώδη τρόπον, ὅπου εὐρίσκεται εἰς τὴν θείαν εὐχαριστίαν, εἶναι καὶ εἰς τὴν γῆν ὁ αὐτὸς Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, κατὰ μετουσίωσιν. Ἐστῶντας καὶ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ ἄρτου νὰ μεταβάλλεται εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ οἴνου εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ ὅποῖον πρέπει νὰ δοξάζωμεν καὶ νὰ λατρεύωμεν τὴν ἁγίαν εὐχαριστίαν ὁμοίως καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Σωτῆρά μας Ἰησοῦν.

Quest. 107.—The priest who administers the Eucharist must know that at the moment when he consecrates (ἀγιάζει) the Bread and Wine, the substance of the Bread is changed (μεταβάλλεται) into that of Christ’s Body, and the substance of the Wine into that of Christ’s Blood, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, Whom the priest invokes, saying: ‘Κατά-

πεμψον τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα, καὶ ποιήσον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ. For immediately after these words the transubstantiation takes place—ἡ μετουσίωσις παρενθὺς γίνεται.

II. CONFESSION OF DOSITHEOS, PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM
(A.D. 1672-1707), CONTAINED IN THE RECORDS OF THE
SYNOD OF JERUSALEM (A.D. 1672).

Article 17.—Concerning the Eucharist. ‘We believe that in the ministration of this Sacrament the Lord Jesus Christ is present . . . in truth and reality (ἀληθῶς καὶ πραγματικῶς), so that after the consecration (ἁγιασμός) of the Bread and the Wine, the Bread is changed, transubstantiated, made again, transformed (μεταβάλλεσθαι, μετουσιοῦσθαι, μεταποιεῖσθαι, μεταρρύνθμίζεσθαι) into the very true Body of the Lord, which (ὁπερ) was born in Bethlehem of her who is ever-virgin, baptized in Jordan, suffered, was buried, rose again, sitteth at the right hand of GOD the Father, and will come upon the clouds of heaven; and the Wine is made again and transubstantiated (μεταποιεῖσθαι καὶ μετουσιοῦσθαι) into the very true Blood of the Lord, which, whilst He hung upon the Cross, was shed for the life of the world.’ The same Article of Dosithéos’ Confession teaches that after the consecration of the Bread and Wine, their substances no longer remain, but only their accidents, under which are the very Body and Blood of the Lord. At the same time, the term μετουσίωσις is not set forth as explaining or revealing the manner of the change, for this is incomprehensible to all, save GOD alone. It is to be understood as signifying that,

after the consecration of the elements, Christ is present in them not τυπικῶς or εἰκονικῶς, but ἀληθῶς, πραγματικῶς καὶ οὐσιωδῶς. Consult Kimmel, *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis*, Part i. pp. 126, 456-463; Part ii. p. 127. The 'Confession of Dositheos' and the 'Orthodox Confession' are accepted by all the Orthodox churches as exhibiting the standard of Orthodox belief and doctrine.

FINIS

Eastern Church Association.

OBJECTS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

- (1) To give information as to the state and position of the Eastern Christians, in order gradually to better their condition through the influence of public opinion.
 - (2) To make known to the Christians of the East the doctrine and principles of the Anglican Church.
 - (3) To take advantage of all opportunities which the Providence of God shall afford for Intercommunion with the Orthodox Church, and also for friendly intercourse with the other ancient Churches of the East.
 - (4) To assist as far as possible the Bishops of the Orthodox Church in their efforts to promote the spiritual welfare and the education of their flocks.
-

The Eastern Church Association was originally founded by the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS about forty years ago. It was revived in 1893 with the object of arousing interest in the Churches of the East, and of attempting to influence public opinion on the best methods of Missionary efforts in those countries where remains of the great Eastern Churches still exist. With this object in view it has produced various publications, and would be glad to add to their number did funds permit; it has twice sent representatives to the East, accounts of whose visits have been published in the Annual Reports; and it has maintained in Cyprus an English Clergyman who has been engaged in teaching and in other work connected with the Church of the Island.

At present the Association is somewhat hampered by want of funds. It is very desirable that the number of Members should be increased, and that meetings should be held to promote the objects of the Association. Any who are desirous of becoming Members are requested to communicate with the Rev. C. BIGGS, St. Philip and St. James' Vicarage, Oxford, to whom all letters should be addressed.

STANDING COMMITTEE.

The Rt. Rev. the BISHOP OF READING (*Chairman*), Christ Church, Oxford.
The Very Rev. the DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.
Rev. N. T. GARRY, Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Taplow Rectory, Bucks.
Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, Canon of St. Paul's, Amen Court, London, E.C.
Rev. T. A. LACEY, Madingley Rectory, Cambridge.
Rev. S. J. M. PRICE, St. Ives' Vicarage, Hunts.
Very Rev. R. MILBURN BLAKISTON, The Deanery, Hadleigh, Suffolk.
Rev. F. E. BRIGHTMAN, Pusey House, St. Giles, Oxford.
Rev. R. F. BIGG-WITHER, Wonston Rectory, Micheldever, Hants.
Sir THEODORE C. HOPE, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., 21 Elvaston Place, S.W.
G. W. E. RUSSELL, Esq., 18 Wilton Street, S.W.
W. J. BIRKBECK, Esq., 32 Sloane Gardens, S.W.
C. R. FREEMAN, Esq., 20 Gutter Lane, Cheapside.
EDWIN FRESHFIELD, Esq., LL.D., 35 Russell Square, W.C.
ATHELSTAN RILEY, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, W.
Colonel HARDY, Crowthorne, Berks.
GEORGE J. MURRAY, Esq., 9 Amen Court, E.C.

Treasurer—G. T. BIDDULPH, Esq., 43 Charing Cross.

Secretary—Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, The Rectory, Welwyn, Herts.

Assistant-Secretary—Rev. C. BIGGS, St. Philip and St. James' Vicarage, Oxford.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

I.

Crown 8vo, 8s. 6d.

EAST SYRIAN DAILY OFFICES.

Translated from the Syriac, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices, and an Appendix containing the Lectionary and Glossary, by ARTHUR JOHN MACLEAN, M.A., Dean of Argyll and the Isles, joint Author of *The Catholicos of the East and his People*.

II.

Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

RUSSIA AND THE ENGLISH CHURCH DURING THE LAST FIFTY YEARS.

VOL. I.—Containing a Correspondence between Mr. WILLIAM PALMER, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and M. KHOMIAKOFF, in the Years 1844-1854, edited by W. J. BIRKBECK, M.A., F.S.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.

III.

Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

THE TEACHING OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

By ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, B.D., Rector of Welwyn, Herts.

* * * *These works can be obtained at a reduced rate by Members of the Eastern Church Association on application to the Secretary.*

LONDON : RIVINGTONS.

